HARVARD UKRAINIAN STUDIES

Volume II Number 2 June 1978

Ukrainian Research Institute
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

ISSN 0363-5570

Published by the Ukrainian Research Institute of Harvard University,
Cambridge, Massachusetts, U.S.A.

Printed by the Harvard University Printing Office
Typography by Brevis Press, Cheshire, Conn.

CONTENTS

CONTRIBUTORS

James Cracraft is associate professor of history at the University of Illinois, Chicago.

Orest Subtelny is assistant professor of history at Hamilton College and associate of the Ukrainian Research Institute of Harvard University.

George H. Williams is Hollis Professor of Divinity at Harvard University.

Daniel Rancour-Laferriere is assistant professor of Russian at Tufts University.

John-Paul Himka is visiting assistant professor of history and associate of the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies at the University of Alberta.

DISCUSSION

The Dawn of Secularized Thought in the Ukraine

This issue of *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* introduces the section of Discussion. We hope to develop this section in two ways: first, by publishing together articles treating a pivotal epoch from different angles, or, second, by initiating discussion of a particular problem and publishing the resulting articles, comments, and replies. This discussion follows the first approach.

The emergence of secular ideas and their penetration into Orthodox thought during the seventeenth century was one of the most significant developments in pre-modern Ukraine. The chasm in intellectual thought that occurred afterwards was the result of external factors. The events of 1708 and 1709 — the destruction of Baturyn, the battle of Poltava, and related events — totally transformed Ukrainian society. Concepts of Kiev as a "Second Jerusalem" and of the Ukraine as the Christian "frontier" collapsed, and the concepts of a secular political state and of allegiance to a secular ruler were superimposed by a victorious Russia.

The Ukrainian scholar Feofan Prokopovyč played a major role in this development. His switch from a politically-colored religious ideology to an ecclesiastically-colored political one remains a mystery to scholars even today. It may not be so mysterious, however, if one considers the great change that had occurred on Ukrainian lands. Prior to 1708, the Ukraine had been autonomous in the conduct of political, intellectual, religious, and social life, and Kiev was experiencing a cultural rebirth. After 1709, the area was reduced to a province of Russia, and in Kiev possibilities for political or intellectual development became nil. Ukrainian intellectuals' work was reduced to a transmitting of the new concepts emanating from the Russian capital.

The articles of Professor James Cracraft and Professor Orest Subtelny address these problems independently and differently. Each contains new findings and introduces new vistas. In publishing them together here, we hope to further understanding of early modern Ukraine.

The Editors

PROKOPOVYČ'S KIEV PERIOD RECONSIDERED

JAMES CRACRAFT

More than twenty years ago, in an article which remains influential, the "late" Jurij Šerech argued that in concentrating on Feofan Prokopovyč's activities as a church reformer and the leading ideologist of Peter I certain "Russian liberal and revolutionary historians" greatly oversimplified, if not actually distorted, our view of Prokopovyč's earlier, Ukrainian or Kiev period. Šerech argued, in particular, that a major literary effort of this period, Prokopovyč's tragicomedy *Vladymyr,* "was not and could not be an apotheosis of Peter"; furthermore, he maintained, even Jaroslav Hordyns'kyj was wrong to suggest (in 1920) that the real hero of the play was Hetman Mazepa. Šerech was not unwilling to detect in the Prokopovyč of these years latent signs of the overt *homo politicus* of the later, St. Petersburg/Moscow or Russian period. But in essence we were asked to agree that at this time, in Kiev, Prokopovyč's interests were still "chiefly ecclesiastical"; that in *Vladymyr* any "contemporary allusions are confined to that sphere"; that both the tragicomedy and two contemporary sermons "belong in the sphere of the Ukrainian literature of the second half of the seventeenth century"; and that what needed emphasizing was Prokopovyč's "complete saturation in the problems and affairs of the Ukraine." Indeed, in Šerech's revision Prokopovyč was at this time a spokesman for "Ukrainian national and political consciousness," champion of a cause which in St. Petersburg, or even before, while still in Kiev, he was to abandon — even as he abandoned, in serving Peter, the higher claims of his spiritual calling.[1]

1 J. Šerech [George Y. Shevelov], "On Teofan Prokopovič as Writer and Preacher in His Kiev Period," *Harvard Slavic Studies,* 1954, no. 2 (reprinted 1971), pp. 211–23: the article is cited, e.g., in I. P. Eremin [Jerjomin], ed., *Feofan Prokopovič: Sočinenija* (hereafter *Sočinenija*) (Moscow and Leningrad, 1961), p. 478, and by H.-J. Härtel, *Byzantinisches Erbe und Orthodoxie bei Feofan Prokopovič* (Würzburg, 1970), p. 91. On Šerech and his remarkable career, see the introduction (by George Y. Shevelov) to Šerech's "posthumous" *Ne dlja ditej: Literaturno-krytyčni statti i eseji,* edited by Shevelov (New York, 1964).

Thus Šerech focused attention, in a most stimulating way, on a comparatively neglected period of Prokopovyč's life while dislodging certain older, often simplistic views of it. The purpose of the present article is not so much to challenge Šerech's own assessment of the author of *Vladymyr* and the two sermons in question—an assessment to whose subtleties I have not done justice—as it is to refine, perhaps, or to develop at least some of its main points. For since Šerech wrote, further research and publication in the Soviet Union and elsewhere have yielded fuller and more precise information about the whole range of Prokopovyč's oeuvre, including that of his Kiev period, just as more recent work in early modern Ukrainian history generally has encouraged us to think more carefully about events during the time and to see them from a Ukrainian as well as a Russian perspective.[2]

The importance of reconsidering Prokopovyč's Kiev period — or one phase of his Kiev period—should perhaps be emphasized. Obviously, the better we understand his antecedents, the better we can understand Prokopovyč in his major historical role, namely, as Peter I's collaborator in creating the Russian Empire.[3] But beyond this, and especially if we take in certain of Prokopovyč's other works from before 1709 or so, his extensive lectures on poetics and rhetoric as well as the play and two sermons, we shall see that this phase of Prokopovyč's life in Kiev coincided with a most critical time in the larger world around him. It might be agreed that taken together these works can help to illuminate—in a more personal or human way, at any rate — a larger crisis: the dilemma, in a word, of a Ukraine caught up in the maelstrom of the Northern War. It will be argued, more specifically, that *Vladymyr* and the other works in question show their author to have been not only a proponent of a kind of Ukrainian nationalism, but something of an incipient ideologist of the Petrine empire, too. Finally, even in so brief an essay as this, problems of interest to students of language and literature as well as to historians will be raised. Judging from what is known of his surviving works, in both manuscript and printed versions, Prokopovyč was the most original, if not the most prolific writer of his generation.

[2] Some of this new work is referred to below. For Prokopovyč's oeuvre, see Eremin, *Sočinenija*, and James Cracraft, "Feofan Prokopovich: A Bibliography of His Works [including MSS.]" *Oxford Slavonic Papers*, n.s. 8 (1975): 1–36 (hereafter "Bibliography").

[3] For an introduction to his whole career, see F. Venturi, "Feofan Prokopovič," *Annali della facoltà di lettere e filosofia e di magistero dell'Università di Cagliari*, vol. 21, pt. 1 (1953); or James Cracraft, "Feofan Prokopovich," in J. G. Garrard, ed., *The Eighteenth Century in Russia* (Oxford, 1973), pp. 75–105.

I

Prokopovyč's lectures on poetics, which he gave at the Kiev academy in 1705–1706, provide important evidence about his intentions in writing *Vladymyr*.[4] In them he taught that the duty of poetry was to portray in verse and in some sense to explain the actions of men and their speech, and that in so doing poetry was to be, quoting Horace, both "delightful and useful." The genres of epic and tragedy were particularly recommended, their beauties explained at length, and the differences between epic or dramatic works on historical themes (such as *Vladymyr*) and history itself emphasized. Prokopovyč taught that, apart from their formal differences, history was concerned with what actually happened while poetry either made up events completely or told them as they might or should have happened. A passage from Livy's history of Rome was compared with a passage on the same subject (the rape of Lucretia) from Ovid's *Fasti*, and the result was in Ovid's favor. For it was to be noted that if the poet closely followed in the steps of the historian, he was not content just to relate events, but, within the rules of his art, injected something of himself into their telling. This he did so as to show us the ravished Lucretia's dilemma and to reveal her inner thoughts, so that we might see her tears and the blush on her cheek and might feel the pathos of her death. Prokopovyč's students were to understand that poetry was free of history's trammels (especially confining in the case of Latin annalistic historiography). They were to see that even when dealing with historical events, with grave matters lifted from the civic annals, poetry strived by its artifices to penetrate the heart and to communicate emotion.

Prokopovyč's doctrine of poetic license in historical matters and his notion of poetry's duty both to communicate emotion and to be "useful," are points to bear in mind when approaching *Vladymyr*. But more important here is the element of patriotism recurrent both in his lectures on poetics and in those on rhetoric which he gave the following year (1706–1707).[5] In both we find the patriotism, civic and imperial, of the

[4] *De arte poetica libri III ad usum et institutionem studiosae juventutis Roxolanae dictati Kioviae in Orthodoxa Academia Mohyleana a.d. 1705*, ed. by G. Konisskij (Mogilev, 1786), reprinted in *Sočinenija*, pp. 229–334: quotations hereafter are from the latter edition. For further details, see Cracraft, "Bibliography," no. 167.

[5] *De arte rhetorica libri decem: A Theophano Procopovicz, olim ex variis authoribus, collecti*, manuscript of 1749 preserved at the Lenin Library, Moscow (fond 354, no. 221, 178 ll.); quotations hereafter are from this manuscript. Cf. Cracraft, "Bibliography," no. 168.

Roman historians on which the teacher drew liberally for examples. Then there is the obvious "patriotism," religious rather than national (Euro-ethnic? racial?), of Tasso's *Gerusalemme liberata*, which Prokopovyč quoted at length, seven times, in the Polish verse translation of Piotr Kochanowski (1566–1620). The reason for this is not hard to find. Apart from its aesthetic beauties, apart from the fact that it was probably the most widely read and imitated literary work of foreign origin in contemporary Poland, the epic of conflict between medieval Christian and Moslem (between Orthodox Slav and Turk or Tatar) must have had an immediate appeal in Prokopovyč's milieu. Finally, and much closer to home, there is the more or less explicit local patriotism, religious and civic if not clearly "national," which can be detected in many of the teacher's references.

Thus in his lectures on rhetoric, Prokopovyč, having defined history as the "witness of the times, the light of truth, the living memory, the great teacher," asked his students whether history was not especially important in their own land, where so much of its glorious past was completely forgotten: where, indeed, history was used by their enemies (mainly Polish Jesuits, to his mind) to confound and oppress them. Similarly, in Prokopovyč's detailed and vigorous denunciation of what he termed the "Polish eloquence," we find more than a classicist's distaste for the eccentricities of the late Polish Baroque. For the "Polish eloquence," too often taken as a model by "earnest youth of the Orthodox faith," not only did "great harm to oratory" but "even to the state and religion." By means of it "our enemies" both openly and insidiously fostered a hostile, falsifying, and reproachful view of "our fatherland and faith." Here one can also cite Prokopovyč's sometimes bitter attacks, still in the rhetoric lectures, on "papist deceivers" who distorted the church fathers, or his extraordinarily detailed and sometimes quite hilarious allegations against the Jesuits. Moreover, an element of local patriotism appears in two of his own poems which Prokopovyč presented to his students of poetics as examples of the principles he was expounding. In one, entitled "Descriptio situs urbis Kiioviae," he extolled the beauties of Kiev's geographical situation. In the other, written in praise of the Dnieper, he referred to the river's "greatest monument," namely, to Kiev, the "glory of the fatherland" and "mother of a powerful empire," which the river nourished and protected and whence, long ago, armed ships sailed against enemies even down to the Black Sea.

As to formal structure, *Vladymyr* is explicitly identified by its author as a tragicomedy; and in his lectures on poetics Prokopovyč naturally had

something to say about this matter, too. Invoking, as usual, the authority of various classical writers, he defined tragicomedy as a "mixed genre" combining the quite distinct elements of both tragedy and comedy. Like tragedy, it reproduced in verse and through performers' gestures the deeds and sorrows of great men as well as the vicissitudes of fortune, and it was replete with lofty sentiments and "regal periphrases." Like comedy, however, it also exposed, in jocular and waggish fashion and in appropriately simple, rustic, plebeian verse, the benighted ways of "vile persons." Prokopovyč cited Plautus's *Amphitruo* as an example of the genre. He went on to specify that a tragicomedy was to consist of five acts subdivided into scenes, that it was to have a chorus standing outside the action of the play and articulating the moral and religious sentiments evoked by it, and so on. The subject or plot of comedy—its *argumentum*—was always the author's invention, said Prokopovyč, while that of tragedy was usually drawn from history or from a well-known tale (*nota fabula*): the *argumentum* of tragicomedy, accordingly, was a mixture of the two. The unity of time was to be preserved, and the meter was to be "impure" iambic, although if a work were written in the "vernacular idioms" of Polish or Slavonic a verse of thirteen syllables was to be employed.

It could be shown that the whole of *Vladymyr*'s opening monologue, given by the ghost of Jaropolk, parallels that of Tantalus's shade in Seneca's tragedy *Thyestes* or the equally infernal speech of the ghost of Thyestes himself in *Agamemnon*—indeed, that the influence of Seneca, so profound in the development of dramatic literature elsewhere in Europe, pervades *Vladymyr*, too. It might also be argued that the play manifests an attempt both to purify and to enrich the local literary language according to its own and classical Latin norms; that the poetry of *Vladymyr* often surpasses, in its rhymes and meters, its consonances, its alterations of length of line and of high and low speech, in its use of the octave and of folksong, any that was written before in Kiev or for that matter anywhere east of the Dnieper; that just "technically the play is a marked improvement over the conventional school drama of the Ukraine."[6] But here it is enough perhaps to emphasize that when Prokopovyč sat down to write his play he had very definite notions about what such a work should be, and that to read *Vladymyr* now is to see how faithfully the playwright struggled to exemplify the principles of the pro-

[6] H. B. Segel, ed. and trans., *The Literature of Eighteenth-Century Russia*, 2 vols. (New York, 1967), 1: 39.

fessor. Further, it seems clear that in writing a tragicomedy in verse on a local historical theme, Prokopovyč produced a work which in its historical and geographical context was at the very least unusual, at the most unique. *Vladymyr,* this is to urge, does not very readily "belong in the sphere of the Ukrainian literature of the second half of the seventeenth century."[7]

One last general point about the play should be stressed before we turn to its content. As was the custom at the Kiev academy, it was written by the poetics teacher for his students to present. It was performed (or simply recited) at the academy on 3 July 1705—at the end, approximately, of the school year and less than a fortnight before St. Volodimer's (Vladimir's) feastday (15 July), whose proximity may well have influenced the choice of subject.[8] *Vladymyr* was above all an academic exercise, and it must not be disengaged from its pedagogical setting.

[7] Šerech, "On Teofan Prokopovič," p. 221. Cf. N. Petrov, *Očerki iz istorii ukrainskoj literatury XVIII veka: Kievskaja iskustvennaja literatura XVIII veka, preimuščestvenno dramatičeskaja* (Kiev, 1880), pp. 25–26, 28ff.; also N. Petrov, *Kievskaja akademija vo vtoroi polovine XVIII veka* (Kiev, 1895), pp. 104ff.

Vladymyr has proved difficult indeed for literary historians to classify. Its neoclassical tendency ("classicist," "proto-classicist," "pseudo-classicist") has been stressed by a long line of pre-Revolutionary and Soviet scholars, and its Baroque features, by G. Voyt, "Die Tragikömodie 'Vladimir' des Feofan Prokopovič: Ein Kiewer Schuldrama des Jahres 1705 und seine Beziehungen zum barocken Schuldrama Europas" (Ph.D. diss., Graz University, 1968) and by D. Čiževskij [Čyževs'kyj], *History of Russian Literature: From the Eleventh Century to the End of the Baroque* (The Hague, 1971), p. 363. Its affinities to the Italian Renaissance are discussed by Segel, *Literature of Eighteenth-Century Russia,* and by D. S. Mirsky, *A History of Russian Literature* (New York, 1949), p. 36. Professor Segel also remarks, in a letter of 8 April 1975, that "what has always struck me odd about [*Vladymyr*] is the fact of its being a 'tragicomedy.' The genre wasn't really compatible with neo-classicism, but was cultivated during the Renaissance, especially in Italy. Somehow I have the impression that in faroff Kiev, Western classicism didn't really have much of an impact on Prokopovich (in the early 18th c.), and that the use of the tragicomic form by him in 1705 was a kind of throwback to his Italian Renaissance studies. To my mind, whatever its other qualities the *Vladimir* is fairly unique by virtue of its form." (Prokopovyč studied in Rome between 1698 and 1701, and there is considerable evidence, apart from *Vladymyr,* that he came under the influence of certain late Italian Renaissance writers at that time.)

[8] On the Kiev academy at this time, its customs and practices, see Petrov, *Kievskaja akademija*; D. Višnevskij, *Kievskaja akademija v pervoj polovine XVIII stoletija* (Kiev, 1903); and S. Golubev, *Kievskaja akademija v konce XVII i načale XVIII stoletij* (Kiev, 1901). For details, see also V. Askočenskij, *Kiev s drevnejšim ego učiliščem akademieju,* 2 vols. (Kiev, 1856); N. Muxin, *Kievo-Bratskij učiliščnyj monastyr': Istoriko-arxeologičeskij očerk* (Kiev, 1895); and idem, *Kievo-Bratskij učiliščnyj monastyr': Istoričeskij očerk* (Kiev, 1893). A valuable introduction in English is A. Sydorenko, *The Kievan Academy in the 17th Century* (Ottawa, 1977).

II

The central drama of *Vladymyr* occurs in the third (the longest by far) and the fourth of its five acts.[9] In Act III, Kiev's chief pagan priest (of the god Perun) confronts, in the presence of Prince Vladymyr, a "philosopher (*filosof*)" who has been sent to him by the "Greek [alternately "Byzantine" or "Roman"] tsar." The previous two acts have revealed the consternation, the ignominy, the bathos, indeed the comedy of the chief priest and his colleagues who, enthralled by the devil, have formed an unholy alliance with the nasty ghost of Vladymyr's vanquished brother, Jaropolk. So now the chief priest pleads with Vladymyr not to abandon the old gods and tries by various ploys to impugn the tsar's motives, finally insisting that the prince declare to the tsar's emissary that "we do not wish to hear / anything from you, nor to receive your advice. / We have gods aplenty." But Vladymyr and his sons, Borys and Hlib (Boris and Gleb), will hear the philosopher out. In the next two scenes (3 and 4 of Act III), perhaps the most remarkable of the play, the philosopher first debates with the chief priest the relative merits of their respective religions and then, having exposed the latter's vacuity, he goes on to expound Christian doctrine to the prince, arguing first from natural reason, with references to classical philosophers (Plato and Epicurus are mentioned by name), and then from the Scriptures and Creed. The exposition is clearly meant to be a *tour de force*. Prince Vladymyr (Act IV), mightily impressed by the philosopher's logic and learning, by the doctrine of eternal life, and especially, it seems, by the possibility of eternal damnation, takes counsel with his sons and then with himself. Finally, he emerges a convinced Christian, although we are shown that his conversion occurred only after he had wrestled with his false pride and lust and with the various doubts and anxieties of a more political nature perhaps sown in his mind by the chief priest's diatribes. The remainder of the play (Act V) is an anti-

[9] The following discussion is based on the critical edition of *Vladymyr* by Eremin, in *Sočinenija*, pp. 149–206, with editor's notes, pp. 475–79. This edition is based on a manuscript copy of 1751 in "fine Ukrainian cursive" which has been collated with five other eighteenth-century manuscript copies to be found in Soviet collections (see ibid., pp. 6–14). Variants are indicated in footnotes to Eremin's basic text. The language of *Vladymyr* can be considered "Ukrainian Slavonic": cf. D. D. Blagoj, *Istorija russkoj literatury XVIII veka* (Moscow, 1945), p. 62: "The play is written in a Ukrainianized Church Slavonic, and thus is to be regarded as a phenomenon rather of Ukrainian [than of Russian] literature."

climax. We learn of the destruction of the old gods and of Vladymyr's splendid public baptism, presided over by the prince's godfather, the "despot" sent by the tsar. Vladymyr himself, now styled "in holy baptism... Vasilij, Great Prince of Kiev and Ruler *vsex rossyjskyx stran*," writes to his chief warrior conveying his enthusiasm for the new faith, confirming his order everywhere to destroy the pagan idols, and announcing that henceforth their arms, like those of the great Constantine, are to be emblazoned with the cross.

The play presents the conflicting claims on Vladymyr of his native paganism and of Christianity, of Perun's chief priest and of the Greek philosopher, as a contest for the prince's mind between the forces of darkness and those of light, between ignorance (or superstition) and learning (or enlightenment), and between vice (e.g., the pagan's aggressive rudeness) and virtue (e.g., the Christian's modest decorum). At the core of the drama is reason: that is, the rational discourse of the main characters or, in the case of the pagan priest, his failure or inability to engage in the same. "What did he say that was obscure? What was against reason (*protyv razumu*)?," Vladymyr asks of the philosopher's speech. There are no miracles or visions here, no thunder and lightning, no sinking fortunes suddenly to be saved. Vladymyr explicitly rejects the priest's suggestions (although privately he is later tempted by them) that the Byzantine emperor and his emissary sought to undermine the prince's authority, belittle his nation, or threaten war. His conversion is represented as an act of piety, to be sure, but also as one of courage and good sense: as an act, above all, of wise statesmanship.

At one time or another in the play the pagan priests—Žeryvol, Kurojad, and Pyar ("Gobble-Ox," "Chicken-Eater," and "Drunkard")[10]—are made to embody the seven deadly sins as well as most of the lesser ones, not excluding sedition and treachery. They are, in effect, most thoroughly satirized, a feature of the play which has occasioned much scholarly comment. By contrast, the tsar's emissary, as Borys says, is a "philosopher exceedingly famous in Greece... renowned for his learning and eloquence, adept in foreign tongues, including our *ruskyj*. Moreover they say that even such a man is not puffed up, but mild-mannered." The philosopher is portrayed as more of a humanist, really, than a missionary—Vladymyr is moved, for instance, by the recollection of his "sweet speech." Borys and Hlib are the sensible, supportive sons; Mečyslav ("Glory-Sword") and Xrabryj ("the Brave"), both fictitious, like the

10 Šerech's translations as given in "On Teofan Prokopovič."

priests, are the prince's noble warriors. As for Vladymyr himself, he is stern, majestic, provident, and unquestionably authoritative: even the pagan gods, through their minister, beg his mercy, while the thought of a God beyond his control and of a life everlasting helps convert this man of power to Christianity. We are made to see, indeed to feel, the war within him. In his conversion, as in his awareness of his people's barbarity ("our folk is hard, and unlettered, / and abhors writing"), Vladymyr is presented as something of a model prince.

Indeed, the air of humanism, of humor and skepticism (mindful of the strong satirical element), of political sensitivity, of professorial learning and of secularism that inhabits *Vladymyr* is unmistakable. This is not to say that the play is basically anti-religious, or, much less, that it is anti-Christian. Rather, in its content and form, as well as in its treatment of the Vladymyr story, the play reflects the learned and worldly cleric of its author's lectures on poetics and rhetoric. Nor is this to accept the scholarly tradition that in satirizing the pagan priests Prokopovyč was necessarily pointing the finger at his fellow Orthodox clergy or, in another opinion, at the Uniate clergy across the border in Polish territory.[11] It might as well be said, from what we know of his mental world at this time, that Prokopovyč had in mind Jesuits or Roman Catholic clergy generally or even Old Believers (if he had as yet met any; he would ridicule them mercilessly later in his career),[12] or that he created the philosopher of the play as a self-portrait. Altogether, it may be safest to conclude that in the pagan priests the playwright meant to expose — apart from the darkness of medieval paganism — ignorance, superstition, credulity, and hypocrisy wherever they appeared, and that he thus revealed, already in 1705, a cast of mind which was to be much in evidence in the church reformer of later years: a cast of mind, indeed, which no doubt contributed fundamentally to the making of the later church reformer.

But it is the element of patriotism contained in *Vladymyr* that is more at issue here. Early in the play, on seeing Kiev again, the ghost of Jaropolk exclaims:

> This place! Here the princely throne, here the power *vserossyjskoj oblasty*, and such great glory
> My envious brother maintains....

[11] For the first view, see P. V. Verxovskoj, *Učreždenie Duxovnoj kollegii i Duxovnyj reglament*, 2 vols. (Rostov-on-Don, 1916), 1: 131, citing the works of previous scholars; for the second, see Petrov, *Očerki iz istorii ukrainskoj literatury*, pp. 227ff., and Šerech, "On Teofan Prokopovič," p. 215.

[12] Cf. Mirsky, *History of Russian Literature*, p. 36.

Similarly, in the play's concluding ode the chorus, impersonating St. Andrew and a suite of angels, sings of "Kiev, my beloved city!" and of the "wonder of thy glory, city of God!" It is prophesied that with Vladymyr's conversion Kiev will become a city of saints and martyrs and holy places, a shrine to which pilgrims will come from many lands and where "famous princes — O miracle! — [will] seek riches from poor holy men," and that Kiev will become sacred to all *"Rossyja."* Furthermore, the destruction of Kiev by (presumably) the Mongols is foretold, along with its even more glorious revival "seven centuries hence," or in about 1690, when "wise men, teachers, men strong, brave in battle, most capable" will be found within its walls. At this point, the ode's contemporary allusions become quite concrete. The incumbent metropolitan of Kiev is referred to, as is Stefan Javors'kyj (1658–1722), formerly professor of the Kiev academy but now, in 1705, metropolitan of Rjazan' and acting head of the Russian church. *"O cerkvy rossyjskyja!* How much light from these [leaders] shall shine on thee in those years!"

Thus the playwright celebrated Kiev as a city with a glorious past which was now undergoing a renaissance and which was as praiseworthy for its churchmen and scholars as for its statesmen or warriors. This note of civic pride is the first and perhaps only quite unambiguous element of patriotism to be found in *Vladymyr* (as it is in the two contemporary poems referred to above): a pride which may well have derived, at a personal level, from Prokopovyč's Kievan burgher origins, from his life-long residence in the city, from his association, since childhood, with the Kiev academy (where his uncle and protector had also been professor), and from his classical-Renaissance studies in Rome.[13] Beyond this, or more broadly, however, are the play's references to *Rossyjskyja cerkvy, Rosyja / Rossyja, vsex rossyjskyx stran, vserossyjskoj oblasty, rossyjskyj rod, slavenorossyjskyj narod.* The question naturally arises, what did the playwright mean, in any contemporary sense, by these terms? Did he mean to refer, whether primarily or exclusively, to the Ukraine and to the local Ukrainian church? Or did he, as seems more likely, deliberately allude to the entire church subordinate to the Moscow patriarchate (the office exercised by Stefan Javors'kyj) and to the whole territory ultimately ruled — or defended — by the Muscovite tsar?

[13] For details of Prokopovyč's life to 1705, with full references, see James Cracraft, "Feofan Prokopovich and the Kiev Academy," in T. Stavrou and R. Nichols, eds., *Russian Orthodoxy under the Old Regime* (Minneapolis, 1978), pp. 44–64.

The playwright's references to both Hetman Mazepa and Peter I would appear to express the latter view. Mazepa's beneficence to the Kiev academy and to the local church are extolled in the play's concluding ode. But he is also praised for besieging "hostile cities of Maxomet" (i.e., for his participation, under Peter, in the Azov campaigns of 1695–1696?); and he is exhorted to hurry against that "proud beast," the Swedish "lion" (Charles XII), with whom Peter had been at war since 1700 and for his exploits against whom, the ode foretells, Mazepa will be hailed as a "second Samson." The ode, and the play itself, conclude with a prayer that victory, long life, and good fortune be granted to "Tsar Peter, crowned by Thee / and to his most loyal captain (*vožd*), Ioann!" Mazepa is also explicitly linked with Peter in the play's prologue, where the chorus alludes not only to the hetman's protection of "this house of Vladymyr," i.e., the academy, but to his "administration of this fatherland [perhaps "patrimony"] of Vladymyr entrusted of God by the tsar." If this reading of a somewhat obscure passage is valid,[14] then it would indeed seem that the Ukrainian hetmanate or the Ukraine as a whole was considered the patrimony of Vladymyr. On the other hand, the last sentence of this same prologue urges Mazepa to "see in this spectacle [the play and its story], as in a mirror, thy bravery, thy glory, the bond of thy love with the monarch's heart, thy true love of god, thy sincere fervor and zeal for the one Orthodox Apostolic Church of our Catholic faith." It would seem, in other words, that for Prokopovyč the heritage of Vladymyr was of more than local significance. Apparently, the story of the medieval prince's conversion also evoked the common Slavonic-Orthodox cause, a cause which was seen as the unifying bond, under the tsar, of the lands—and the peoples—subject to him.

Yet we are dealing, to be sure, with allusions, more or less artfully phrased. Apart from an unmistakable pride in the city of Kiev and in its academy, it may be safely concluded only that the patriotism of *Vladymyr,* taken as a whole, is broadly Orthodox-Slavic or pan-"Russian" in character; and if such patriotism was "Ukrainian," it was not to the exclusion of Muscovy or of loyalty to its tsar. Similar views, it is worth noting, are expressed in the two contemporary speeches mentioned earlier, and

[14] "... Se že y dom Vladymyrov, se y Vladymyrova čada, kreščenyem svjatym ot neho roždennaja (čto pače vsîx yzajaščnîe na tebî javljaetsja, jasnevelmožnyj pane, ktytore y dobrodîju naš, emu že y stroenye seho otčestva Vladymerovaho po carju ot boha vručenno est, y Vladymyrovymŷ ydjaj ravnymŷ emu pobîdamy, ravnoju v Rossyy ykonomyeju, lyce eho, jako otčeskoe sŷn, na tebî pokazueš) ...." (Eremin, *Sočinenija,* p. 152)

indeed were common, as we shall see, among members of the Ukrainian intellectual elite to which Prokopovyč belonged.

III

The first of these speeches is a sermon of welcome to Peter I preached by Prokopovyč in the Trinity church of the Kiev Monastery of the Caves, in Peter's presence, on 5 July 1706, almost a year to the day after the performance of *Vladymyr.*[15] Peter had arrived in Kiev the day before, preceded by Menšikov and a large army, for the purpose of considering Menšikov's suggestion that the monastery, with its commanding site and "many stone buildings," be newly fortified against the Swedes (Peter found the idea acceptable and on August 15, before hurrying north to defend St. Petersburg, laid the foundation for a modern citadel.)[16] It was the tsar's first visit to the city, and Prokopovyč must have been honored to be chosen to greet him formally, although as the protégé of Metropolitan Varlaam Jasyns'kyj (1627–1707) and the academy's current teacher of poetics and rhetoric he was perhaps the obvious choice.

Expanding on his text for the day, Psalm 149 ("... Let Israel be glad in his maker, let the sons of Sion rejoice in their king [tsar]..."), Prokopovyč showed how glad was proud Kiev, "which for its saints and miracle-working places is usually called the second Jerusalem," to receive "our Most Illustrious Monarch ... the Tsar and Ruler of all *Rossyja.*"[17]

15 *Feofana Prokopoviča Slova i reči poučitel'nyja, poxval'nyja i pozdravitel'nyja sobrannyja*, ed. by S. F. Nakoval'nin, 4 vols. (St. Petersburg, 1760–74), 1: 1–11.

16 *Pis'ma i bumagi Imperatora Petra Velikogo*, 12 vols. (St. Petersburg/Petrograd/Moscow, 1887–1975), 4, pt. 2: 836–38; *Žurnal ili podennaja zapiska ... Gosudarja imperatora Petra Velikogo*, ed. by M. M. Ščerbatov, 2 vols. (St. Petersburg, 1770–72), 1: 126; S. M. Solov'ev, *Istorija Rossii s drevnejšix vremen*, 15 vols. (Moscow, 1962–66), 8: 146–47.

17 Prokopovyč's use here of the phrase "Kiev ... the second Jerusalem" has been interpreted as evidence of his "Ukrainian national and political consciousness" at this time (Šerech, "On Teofan Prokopovič," pp. 219–21; also p. 216). But apart from the exact wording of this passage ("for its saints and miracle-working places [Kiev] is usually called the second Jerusalem"), it should be noted (1) that in all of Prokopovyč's surviving, pre-Poltava (1705–1709) writings—lectures, poems, sermons, the play *Vladymyr*, the whole running into hundreds of manuscript and printed pages—this is the sole instance of his use of the phrase; and (2) that in any case, the evidence for maintaining that the concept of Kiev as the second Jerusalem was necessarily nationalist in import (as distinct from civic or simply religious) is slight. On the second point cf. not only Šerech, "On Teofan Prokopovič," but R. Stupperich, "Kiev—das zweite Jerusalem: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des ukrainisch-russischen Nationalbewusstseins," *Zeitschrift für Slavische Philologie* 12 (1935): 332–54.

Prokopovyč drew a parallel between old Prince Vladymyr, whose "sword conquered many peoples" and under whom *Rossyja* was enlightened by the Gospels," and Peter, Vladymyr's "worthy and true successor," who "hast freed many cities of the Fatherland from the Ottoman yoke and from the shackles of heresy," and who had become patron of Moscow's academy (now, under Javors'kyj's control, virtually Kiev's *filial*). The longest passage of Prokopovyč's speech dwelt on the image of the tsar's two-headed eagle. One head was made to symbolize Peter's military successes, and the other, his domestic accomplishments, above all the establishment of peace, order, and internal security and the promotion of a kind of equality of opportunity for all his subjects regardless of their background or varied customs.[18] This last remark may well have referred to everything from Peter's energetic patronage of Kievans like the speaker himself to the spectacular rise from obscurity of somebody like Menšikov, who was also present on this occasion. It may also have bespoken a certain resentment of aristocratic privilege—locally, of the privileged position of the Cossack elite. At any rate, these and Prokopovyč's other remarks in the sermon cannot have failed to please the tsar, who must have stood, given the size of the church in question (which the present writer recently visited), only a few feet away. Knowing Peter's partiality for a good speech (thus had Javors'kyj come to his attention and been promoted), we might conclude that the seeds of his future collaboration with Prokopovyč were planted on this occasion, in Kiev in 1706, and not at some later date, as historians have supposed.

The other speech mentioned above, a sermon preached on St. Volodimer's feastday (July 15) in, most probably, 1705 or 1706,[19] is not of great interest here. Readers of *Vladymyr* and of the speech just discussed will find the sermon's themes repetitive, at times almost literally so. But noteworthy, again, are the implicit breadth (or vagueness) of the speaker's patriotism—thus his references to *Rossyja, naša pravoslavnorossyjskaja cerkov',* the *rod slavenskyj,* etc.—as well as his depiction of Vladymyr as the enlightener and ideal tsar: throughout the sermon the reference is always to "Tsar Vladymyr." Drawing, he said, on the "chronicle of Nestor," Prokopovyč was concerned to show how Vlady-

[18] "Vidim različie ljudej v odeždax, v domovyx zdanijax i imenax, na sude različija ne vidim; vsi ravni sut': ... Čestnij prinimajut čest', dostojnij voznosjatsja na dostoinstva. Pročiemu že stroeniju kto možet ne udivljatisja? ..." (*Slova i reči,* ed. Nakoval'nin, p. 7).

[19] *Slova i reči,* ed. Nakoval'nin, pp. 335–49; reprinted in *Kievskaja starina* 22 (July 1888), appendix 1: 1–14.

myr triumphed over his enemies, did good for his subjects, maintained justice, and raised the worthy to honor: "when such tsars rule, the people of their tsardoms have a blessed life." The allusions to Peter, however flattering or hopeful, seem obvious.

But, of course, any more definite assessment of the patriotism in Prokopovyč's works of this period depends on our assessment of the state of Ukrainian national or political consciousness generally in the years before the crisis of 1708–1709, when Hetman Mazepa broke with Tsar Peter and the battle of Poltava took place—events which constituted, in Prokopovyč's life as in so many other respects, a decisive turning point. Thus a recent study of these matters, although overlooking the Kievan civic tradition and its possible connections with a nascent Ukrainian nationalism, has identified at least three distinct "Ukrainian political concepts" current at this time.[20] The first and perhaps oldest of these was the Zaporozhian Army tradition, by which "Cossackdom viewed itself as a subsystem within a monarchy," whether the monarchy was the Russian or the Polish or the Ottoman. A second concept, drawn to some extent from a revival of interest in medieval history and expressed practically in the abortive Union of Hadjač of 1658, conceived of a principality of *Rus'* as a separate and equal part of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. The third view, conceived by Orthodox clergy in search of stability and protection after "the Ruin" of 1663–1674, and espoused as early as Gizel's *Synopsis* of 1674, "associated the Rus tradition with the most powerful Orthodox ruler, the Muscovite tsar," thereby making him "the only legitimate successor to [the rulers of] Kievan Rus." This last view appears, indeed, to have been the one expressed by Prokopovyč in his earliest surviving works: one of *Vladymyr's* identifiable sources, it might be noted, is Gizel's *Synopsis*.[21]

Yet, according to this same analysis,[22] the Zaporozhian Army concept proved inappropriate to the complex social and political system which evolved in the Hetmanate after its founding, while Mazepa's defeat at Poltava marked the demise of the concept of a principality of Rus' and the beginning of Moscow's "unquestioned control" over the Hetmanate. Then, for the Cossack-noble elite of this area, "their only remaining political goal was to maintain 'Little Russia' or the Hetmanate as an

20 Zenon E. Kohut, "The Abolition of Ukrainian Autonomy (1763–1786): A Case Study in the Integration of a Non-Russian Area into the Empire" (Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1975), pp. 47–58, 65, and passim.

21 Cf. Eremin, *Sočinenija*, pp. 476–78; Šerech, "On Teofan Prokopovič," p. 221.

22 Kohut, "Abolition of Ukrainian Autonomy."

autonomous part of the newly created Russian Empire"—which in effect meant gaining Imperial recognition of their own privileged status. Here, the "Little Russian" concept is not linked with the concept—the Ukrainian concept—of the Muscovite tsar as heir to the rulers of Kievan Rus' and protector of the church; however, some link seems probable, especially around the time of the Poltava battle and especially among the clergy, who, after all, still constituted the bulk of the Ukrainian intellectual elite. Moreover, while it is suggested here that not only Prokopovyč but such other Ukrainian luminaries as Javors'kyj and Dmytro Tuptalo shared this view of the tsar, it might be objected that to portray the "Ukrainian clerical intelligentsia" as having thus "abandoned Cossack Ukraine" gives rise to the suspicion that extraneous considerations have begun to cloud the picture. For it is also shown here that an articulated concept of a Cossack Ukraine based on a Cossack historical mythology was a *post*-Poltava development, and one which "did not contribute to the development of a political orientation" but rather "completely accepted the status quo," that is, the situation expressed in the concept of a "Little Russia" loyal to the All-Russian tsar and dominated by the local Cossack-noble elite. It is therefore anachronistic, if not perhaps a little tendentious, to imply that this "modified extension of the Zaporozhian Army concept" was the only truly Ukrainian view of the Russian-Ukrainian relationship around the time of Poltava, and that in "serving Russian Orthodoxy," in "spreading education and Western learning in Muscovy," and in anathematizing Mazepa for betraying Peter, the leading Ukrainian clergy betrayed the true Ukrainian cause.

As for the crisis of 1708–1709 itself, it now appears certain that by September 1707, if not before, Mazepa had privately decided to renounce his longstanding allegiance to the tsar and thereafter only awaited the optimum moment for doing so openly.[23] It also seems certain that until his open defection in October 1708, Mazepa had kept his momentous decision from all but the smallest possible number of his closest associ-

[23] See Orest Subtelny, ed. and trans., *On the Eve of Poltava: The Letters of Ivan Mazepa to Adam Sieniawski, 1704–1708* (New York, 1975); also the lengthy account of the Mazepa affair by his chancellor Pylyp Orlyk as contained in his letter of June 1721, sent from abroad to Metropolitan Javors'kyj in Moscow and printed in *Osnova* 1862, no. 11, pp. 1–29: I am grateful to Professor Subtelny for this reference and for permission to quote from his English translation of the letter. See also R. M. Hatton, *Charles XII of Sweden* (New York, 1968), p. 204; and C. Nordmann, *Charles XII et l'Ukraine de Mazepa* (Paris, 1958), p. 20ff. The basic history of Mazepa and the *Mazepyntsi* is still N. I. Kostomarov, *Sobranie sočinenij*, bk. 6, vol. 16 (St. Petersburg, 1905; reprinted The Hague, 1967).

ates, while at the same time adroitly, sometimes dramatically, countering accusations that he intended to betray the tsar. Further, it is clear that developments in the years leading up to Poltava — the international ramifications of the growing Swedish-Russian conflict, the Swedish tendency to subjugate Poland, the Muscovite tendency to subordinate the hetman to the tsar (or to his ministers) and to regularize the Cossack army — had put Mazepa and his followers in an increasingly precarious predicament. But it is also clear that before his defection, and even after, no definite overall policy, particularly in regard to the fate of the Right-Bank Ukraine, had been agreed on by Mazepa and his new allies, the kings of Sweden and Poland (the latter was Stanisław Leszczyński, who had been imposed on Poland by the Swedes after the forced abdication of August II, Peter's ally, in 1704).[24] And legitimate doubts remain as to Mazepa's motives and goals throughout the crisis and as to how widely these were shared or even understood in Kiev and elsewhere in the Ukraine, either before Mazepa went over to the Swedes or even after, when a decisive military confrontation on Ukrainian territory loomed ever larger.

This last is the most relevant point here. In the oath he swore privately before his closest subordinate, Pylyp Orlyk, after Orlyk had discovered his secret (September 1707), Mazepa protested that he acted not for any personal gain but "for all you who are under my rule and command, for your wives and children, for the common welfare of our motherland, poor, unfortunate Ukraine, for the entire Zaporozhian Army and the Little Russian people, for the elevation and expansion of the Army's rights and privileges": he took the same oath some six months later before four more of his senior officers.[25] Similarly, after his open defection and again in the presence of Orlyk, Mazepa "swore on the Holy Gospels for the first time before everyone" — i.e., before the general *starshyna* and all the senior Cossack officers — that he "accepted the protection of the Swedish king not for his personal benefit, but for the general welfare of the whole fatherland and the Zaporozhian Army." At the same time, he issued universals invoking the memory of Xmel'nyc'kyj and encouraging a general revolt against the tsar, who would reduce the Cossacks to slavery and transport resisters beyond the Volga, and against whom, with

24 Hatton, *Charles XII of Sweden*, p. 204; Andrzej Kamiński, *Konfederacja Sandomierska vobec Rosji w okresie poaltransztadzkim 1706–1709* (Wrocław, Warsaw, and Cracow, 1969).
25 Orlyk's letter as cited in fn. 23.

the support of the powerful Swedish king, victory was assured. In the universals Mazepa claimed, in his defense, that he had received warnings of these intentions from some of the tsar's own ministers.[26]

Yet despite his protestations to the contrary, the very same documents indicate, not surprisingly, that Mazepa intrigued, openly maneuvered, and finally went to war against Peter as much for personal as for patriotic or "national" reasons. Their data suggest that Mazepa acted as much to avenge insults inflicted by the upstart Menšikov and to keep the Cossack army intact and under his control, as to preserve or defend the Ukrainian motherland. The hetman knew well that his power and freedom of movement and his own prestige and extensive wealth depended absolutely on his unrestricted command of the Cossack army. The evidence also suggests: (1) that Mazepa had little faith in the Poles' ability to act decisively in concert or in their willingness to accept a unified Ukraine under his autonomous rule, (2) that he had little idea about the intentions, beyond defeating Peter, of his new "protector," the Swedish invader, (3) that he was fearful and wavering in his resolution to abandon the tsar in the face of the gathering storm, (4) that his hope (as reported by Orlyk) of negotiating, with the help of the Swedes, a peaceful settlement between them and Peter, wherein "we will look forward to our complete liberation" (i.e., Ukrainian independence?), was forlorn, and (5) that in any case, though wrapping himself in the mantle of Xmel'nyc'kyj, he could not count on the united support — even the passive support — of his own people. Here, for our analysis, is the heart of the problem. As Mazepa himself secretly wrote to King Stanisław back in September 1707, when planning his break with Peter, "in the Ukraine the officers and their subordinates, and the clergy and laity, [behaving] like wheels of different sizes, are not of one opinion. Some desire Muscovite protection; others have an inclination towards Turkish protection; and a third [group] prefers fraternization with the Tatars because of their antipathy for the Poles.... Therefore, it will first of all be necessary to bring the Army and all the people in Ukraine, on both sides of the Dnieper, to a consensus."[27]

Events were to prove that Mazepa could not achieve such a consensus, whether at the popular level, among the elite, or even within the army — a situation which Peter, on learning with "great surprise" of the hetman's defection,[28] exploited to the full. On the tsar's orders, Mazepa's capital at

[26] Orlyk's letter as cited in fn. 23.
[27] Orlyk's letter as cited in fn. 23.
[28] *Pis'ma i bumagi*, vol. 8, no. 2759: Peter to Menšikov (who had sent him the news: see ibid., pp. 864–65), 27 October 1708.

Baturyn was promptly destroyed, Mazepa himself excommunicated by the leaders of the church, and a new hetman elected. Manifestos issued in the Ukraine by Peter as its "sovereign and protector" denounced Mazepa as "this second Judas," appealed strongly to local religious antipathies, warned of ruin at the hands of the "heretic" Swedes and Catholic Poles unless they were resisted, promised relief from Mazepa's many exactions, and offered clemency to all who would desert him.[29] The manifestos contrast strongly with the defensive, pleading, even desperate tone of Mazepa's universal of January 1709, with its references to Ukrainian disunity and to Cossacks who rallied to the tsar, and its seemingly lame attempt to justify the alliance with the "Christian" king of Sweden (without mentioning the Poles).[30]

In other words, and especially from the perspective of a proud Kievan and rising young cleric who was trying to get on with his teaching duties (Prokopovyč initiated his three-year philosophy course in the fall of 1707), the political situation in the Ukraine in the period before Poltava was such that Mazepa's revolt was no more to be predicted than it was necessarily to be followed. This is the context in which to judge the report—the whole report, not just its final clause—of the Russian governor in Kiev, Prince D. M. Golitsyn, concerning the situation in the Kiev academy and in its supporting monastery in February 1709, in the very midst of the great crisis:

> I have sent from Kiev [Golitsyn reported to Moscow] all the students born in Lithuania and Poland; there remain 161 Little Russian students; in the Brotherhood monastery there are thirty monks, of whom only five are Little Russians but who, though from across the Polish border, have lived from youth in Kiev. Whether [the loyalty of] some of these [five] monks might be suspect, it is hard to say, since they avoid us; in all of Kiev I have found only one person [one "monk," again, probably], namely, the prefect of the Brotherhood monastery [Prokopovyč], who has been affable [literally, who has "condescended": *snisxoditelen*] to us.[31]

It is also the context in which to read Prokopovyč's poem "The Repentant Zaporozhian," which was written most probably soon after the destruction, in April 1709, of the Zaporozhian Sich by a detachment of Russian

[29] *Pis'ma i bumagi*, vol. 8, nos. 2759 ff.; *Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossijskoj Imperii s 1649 goda*, 1st ser., 45 vols. (St. Petersburg, 1830), 4: nos. 2209, 2212, 2213. Also Nordmann, *Charles XII*, pp. 40–42.
[30] Nordmann, *Charles XII*, pp. 68–71.
[31] Solov'ev, *Istorija Rossii*, 8: 268: Golitsyn to Chancellor Golovkin, 15 February 1709.

and Cossack troops, an event which was followed by the return of many ordinary Zaporozhians to their former allegiance:

> What am I to do, I know not,
> But to perish in obscurity:
> I have wandered in impenetrable forests,
> In hungry, arid lands;
> Atamans and hetmans,
> I have fallen prey to your deceptions. . . .
>
> I have angered the autocrat
> With my imprudent heart.
> Yea but it is my firm sense withall
> That God and the tsar are merciful:
> That the sovereign will put away his anger,
> And that God shall not forsake me.[32]

* * *

As is well known, in July 1709 Prokopovyč celebrated Peter's victory at Poltava in both poetry and prose.[33] Subsequently, like Javors'kyj and others before him, he went on to bigger things in Russia. But there is no reason to suppose that in 1708–1709 Prokopovyč had acted in an especially opportunistic or unpatriotic, let alone treacherous, way. On the contrary, the evidence we have suggests that in that critical year Prokopovyč's behavior was fully consistent with his previously expressed views, with the patriotism, such as it was, of *Vladymyr* in particular. In fact, it can now be argued that this patriotism's vague or ambiguous element reflected, perhaps consciously, the political ambiguities of pre-Poltava Ukraine. It can be argued that it was the events of 1708–1709, culminating in the battle of Poltava, that gave more definite shape to Prokopovyč's broader patriotism and produced those views—strongly pro-Peter, monarchical, and All-Russian Imperialist—which are first manifest in his literary celebrations of the tsar's victory.

Prokopovyč was never to waver from such views, although he was to elaborate or apply them, in response to events and to the thrust of his own further development, in increasingly secular and "modern" ways. In so doing he was to become, of course, less "Ukrainian" and more "Russian"—as well as less religious (or academic) and more political. He was

[32] Eremin, *Sočinenija*, p. 214, and editor's commentary, p. 480.
[33] Eremin, *Sočinenija*, pp. 23–38, 209–214; see also Cracraft, "Bibliography," nos. 9 and 158.

to become the fervent exponent of the Petrine revolution in both church and state, leaving himself little time for anything else. He was to be typical, in a broader context, of those clerics, lawyers, academics, and bureaucrats who swelled the ranks of the appropriate institutions everywhere in Europe at this time and who elaborated in their multiform writings philosophies or ideologies commensurate with their rise, the rise of the modern state, and the needs of its rulers: who are to be located, accordingly, on history's upward curve.

However far he may have gone and to whatever extremes he may have been led, perhaps inevitably, there is a basic consistency or continuity, a basic logic, in Prokopovyč's political revolution from his debut in Kiev to his death in St. Petersburg. The ideologist of history is clearly foreshadowed in the teacher and preacher, the poet and playwright, of 1705-1709.

University of Illinois, Chicago

MAZEPA, PETER I, AND THE QUESTION OF TREASON

OREST SUBTELNY

La trahison . . . c'est une question du temps.
Talleyrand

I

One of the most fiercely debated issues in the historiography of Russian-Ukrainian relations revolves around a dramatic event which occurred on 26 October 1708. At the height of the Great Northern War, the seemingly invincible armies of Charles XII of Sweden were pushing deep into the domains of Peter I. The fate of the Romanov dynasty and of Russia itself seemed to hang in the balance. Suddenly, unexpectedly, the beleaguered tsar received shocking news: Ivan Mazepa, hetman of the Ukraine and one of Peter's most trusted associates, had abandoned him to join the invaders. A large part of the Ukrainian Cossack elite and several thousand rank-and-file Cossacks followed their hetman in crossing over to the Swedes.

For the enraged tsar, Mazepa's action was the epitome of treason, and he vehemently proclaimed it as such throughout his realm. On the other hand, the hetman, safely in the Swedish camp, stubbornly claimed that he had had the right, even the duty, to behave as he did. Who was right? Was it or was it not treason that Mazepa committed that day? Generations of Ukrainian and Russian historians have debated this question and still no definitive conclusion has been reached. One might wonder why they have bothered with such a seemingly barren, emotional, and futile issue at all. The answer is that this issue, like the figure of Mazepa himself, is but the tip of the iceberg, marking a deeper, more far-reaching set of historiographical and ideological problems which have beclouded the study of Russian-Ukrainian relations to this day.

At the heart of the problem lies the difficulty of interpreting the relationship between the tsars and the Ukrainian Cossack Hetmanate. It

is the goal of this study to contribute to an understanding of that broader issue through a reexamination of Mazepa's action. Because historians have encumbered the question of Mazepa's treason with an unusually verdant ideological overgrowth, it is useful at the outset to review briefly the major currents in the evaluation of Mazepa's historical role.[1]

Historians who condemned Mazepa did so on the basis of two lines of argument. One, propagated and widely accepted during most of the imperial period, rested on the concept and values of "one and indivisible Russia."[2] Its adherents assumed that a unitary Russian state already existed at the end of the seventeenth century and that the Ukraine was an integral part of it. Since Mazepa's action, regardless of how it might have reflected Ukrainian interests, threatened the security of this Russian state, it was necessarily an act of treason.

The other critical approach to the hetman emerged in the late nineteenth century and relied heavily on populist ideals.[3] Those who evaluated the hetman's actions from this standpoint concluded that he acted primarily in his own and the Cossack elite's interests. Regarding any action so motivated as inherently antithetical to the interests of the masses, the populist historians proclaimed Mazepa a traitor to his own people. As a result, we have in the treatment of Mazepa an unusual occurrence: the normally irreconcilable statist and populist views coincide and reinforce each other in proclaiming the hetman's guilt.

Soviet historians have been especially vigorous in denouncing Mazepa.[4]

1 A survey of the historiography on Mazepa may be found in D. Doroshenko, "Mazepa v istorychnii literaturi i v zhytti," *Pratsi Ukrains'koho naukovoho instytutu* (Warsaw) (hereafter *Pratsi*) 46 (1938): 3–34.

2 Cf., for example, D. Bantysh-Kamenskii, *Istoriia Maloi-Rossii*, 3rd ed. (Moscow, 1842), and, especially, his *Zhizn' Mazepy* (Moscow, 1834); also S. M. Solov'ev, *Istoriia Rossii s drevneishikh vremen*, vol. 9 (Moscow, 1962), p. 615.

3 Among these are the works of such well known nineteenth-century Ukrainian historians as M. Kostomarov, "Mazepa i Mazepyntsi," in his *Istoricheskie monografii i issledovaniia*, vol. 16 (St. Petersburg, 1885); A. Lazarevskii, "Zametki o Mazepe," *Kievskaia starina*, 1898, no. 3, pp. 457–85, no. 4, pp. 131–67, and no. 6, pp. 385–411; and V. Antonovych, *Korotka istoriia Kozachchyny*, 2nd ed. (Kolomyia, 1912).

4 A discussion of the Soviet treatment of Mazepa as perceived by Ukrainian émigré historians can be found in P. Fedenko, "Hetman Mazepa in Soviet Historiography," *Ukrainian Review* 9 (1960): 6–18, and B. Krupnyts'kyi, "Mazepa i soviets'ka istoriohrafia," *Ukrains'kyi zbirnyk*, 1955, no. 2, pp. 26–30. Typical examples of the Soviet treatment of Mazepa are: V. E. Shutoi, "Izmena Mazepy," *Istoricheskie zapiski* 31 (1950): 154–90, and V. C. Koroliuk, "Rech Pospolita, frantsuzskaia dyplomatiia i izmena Mazepy," *Izvestiia Akademii nauk SSSR/ Seria istorii i filosofii*, 1951, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 82–87. For a more recent treatment of this subject see V. E. Shutoi,

Their approach is essentially a synthesis of the two earlier views. By arguing that the coexistence of the Russian and Ukrainian peoples in one unitary state has always been in the best interests of the two peoples, they have presented Mazepa's action as a crime against both the people and their state. However, it seems that concern with Mazepa's crime against the state — that is, with his "separatism" — weighs more heavily with Soviet writers than does his supposed crime against the people. The point of this argumentation is that Ukrainian separatism, as personified by Mazepa, has always been against the interests of the Ukrainian people. In any case, complete and uncompromising condemnation of Mazepa is one practice Soviet historians share with imperial Russian historians.

Defenders of Mazepa appeared relatively late on the historiographical scene.[5] With the rise of Ukrainian national consciousness in the late nineteenth century, studies began to appear which came to his defense. Implicit in these emerging views was the assumption that Ukrainian national consciousness had existed in the hetman's own time and, moreover, that it was this feeling that had motivated his actions.

This interpretation was elaborated and intensely propagated by Ukrainian historians living outside the borders of the Soviet Ukraine, especially after the Ukrainian nationalist forces failed to maintain an independent state in 1917–1921.[6] Frustrated and anxious to prove the

---

"Istorizm 'Poltavy' A. S. Pushkina," *Voprosy istorii,* 1974, no. 12, pp. 114–27. A purely propagandistic approach to Mazepa can be seen in S. Danylenko, "How They Distort History," *Kul'tura i zhyttia* (Kiev), 7 August 1975, p. 2.

[5] Cf. D. Kravtsov, "Het'man Mazepa v ukrains'kii istoriohrafii XIX v.," *Zapysky Istoryko-filolohichnoho viddilu Ukrains'koi Akademii nauk* (Kiev) 6 (1925): 2–18, and B. Krupnyts'kyi, "Het'man Mazepa v otsintsi istorykiv narodnykiv i derzhavnykiv," in his *Istorioznavchi problemy istorii Ukrainy* (Munich, 1959), pp. 48–59. The work that heralded this new approach was F. Umanets, *Hetman Mazepa* (St. Petersburg, 1897). Also cf. A. Kozachenko, "Sobytiia 1708–1709 gg. na Ukraine v osveshchenii ukrainskoi dvorianskoburzhuaznoi istoriografii," *Poltava: K 250-letiiu Poltavskogo srazheniia* (Moscow, 1959).

[6] Consult the articles by Doroshenko and Krupnyts'kyi for a discussion of this trend. Its representatives expressed their views in several impressive collections of articles dedicated to Mazepa: see vol. 92 of *Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva im. Shevchenka* (hereafter *ZNTSh*) which appeared in L'viv in 1909, and vols. 46 and 47 of *Pratsi,* entitled *Mazepa-Zbirnyk,* vols. 1 (1938) and 2 (1939). Three valuable monographs by historians of this school are: B. Krupnitzky, *Hetman Mazepa und seine Zeit* (Leipzig, 1942), O. Ohloblyn, *Het'man Ivan Mazepa i ioho doba* (New York, Toronto, and Paris, 1960), and B. Kentrschynskyj, *Mazepa* (Stockholm, 1962). On a less scholarly level is the series of articles dedicated to Mazepa which appeared in the *Ukrainian Quarterly* during 1959. An example of an extremely nationalistic interpretation of Mazepa is that of Dmytro Doncov [Dontsov], *Pokhid Karla XII na Ukrainu,* 4th ed. (London, 1955).

validity of their cause despite its recent defeat, the nationalist historians eagerly sought historical precedents, or what they considered to be precedents, to support their political and ideological convictions. Mazepa, in their view, seemed ideal for such a precedent-setting role. After all, did he not try to break away from Russia in 1708 just as the nationalists had tried to do in 1917? And was not his goal the establishment of an independent Ukrainian state? This, in any case, was what the nationalists argued.

But it was actually the opponents of the Ukrainian national movement who, long before 1917, first identified the movement's aspirations with Mazepa. Throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, they habitually referred to Ukrainian activists as Mazepists and labeled their movement *Mazepynstvo.* The identification was meant to be derogatory. If the incipient movement could be linked with Mazepa — the latter being traditionally associated with treason — then the movement could also be denounced as treasonous. Ukrainian nationalists, however, did not shy away from this identification. Indeed, they welcomed it. For them it meant that their new and foundering movement and, more specifically, their desire to break away from Russian tutelage, had an impressive pedigree going back for centuries; it was rooted in history and this gave it legitimacy. By virtue of these and similar arguments, Mazepa became the idol of Ukrainian nationalists and has remained so to this day.

Even a cursory analysis of the historiographical treatment (or, more accurately, mistreatment) of Mazepa will quickly lead to the conclusion that the hapless hetman has been drafted by latter-day historians to serve as a symbol, a standard bearer, or a whipping boy for such patently anachronistic conceptions as Ukrainian nationalism, populism, and "one and indivisible Russia" — conceptions which were alien to him and to his time. To a great extent, this explains why Mazepa has always been surrounded by controversy. To be sure, there was a controversy, but it was a conflict of ideas and interests germane to Peter and Mazepa themselves, and ideologically disoriented historians have failed to grasp its essence.

This being the case, what needs to be done is clear: Ranke's famous dictum "wie es eigentlich gewesen" must be applied again. The hetman and the tsar should be allowed to explain in their own terms the rationale for their actions and reactions. In soliciting their views, however, the discussion will be made to focus on the question of "treason." Why? One is tempted to reply: because it is there. But there are other, weightier reasons. The issue of treason provides a convenient conceptual focus for the discussion of a broader, related question: if we know how the hetman and the tsar defined treason, we will be better equipped to understand the

differences in their political values and commitments. And this, in turn, will provide us with an insight into the nature of the relationship between the Muscovite tsar and the Ukraine.

II

It would be somewhat naive to expect to find a tract or discourse by Mazepa on the nature of treason. The hetman was a man of action, not a political theorist. Moreover, the Cossack Ukraine was not the most hospitable environment for political theorizing. What is available, however, are recorded bits and pieces of his conversations. These expromptu statements made in moments of stress or decision can, when pieced together, give a vague but serviceable notion of his political values. Fortunately, Mazepa had a kind of Boswell in the person of Pylyp Orlyk. A learned and intelligent newcomer to the Ukraine, Orlyk served for years as the hetman's personal secretary and later as chancellor of the Zaporozhian Host. After he followed his patron into exile, Orlyk wrote a long, detailed account, probably based on his diary, of how the hetman came to his crucial decision.[7] From this little-known and seldom utilized source, filled with verbatim quotations of Mazepa's musings, convictions and justifications for his actions, it is possible to deduce what the hetman considered to be the limits of political loyalty.

What has always puzzled historians is how, after twenty years of seemingly faithful service to the tsar, Mazepa could have made his decision in 1708. Employing *ex post facto* reasoning, they have usually come to the rather simplistic conclusion that the hetman had never really been sincere in his show of loyalty. Ukrainians, citing the many expressions of their hero's love for his homeland, argued that a Ukrainian patriot such as he could never really have been loyal to a Muscovite regime and that his long years of service were largely spent in surrepti-

[7] Orlyk to Stefan Iavors'kyi, 1 June 1721, *Osnova* (St. Petersburg), 1862, no. 11, pp. 1–29. More than two decades after the event, Orlyk sent this account to his former mentor as part of his attempt to obtain a pardon from the tsar, which explains the anti-Mazepa bias of the letter. However, a number of documentary sources verify the accuracy of Orlyk's statements. Cf. "Donoshenie Kochubeia Gosudariu," in *Istochniki malorossiiskoi istorii*, pt. 2, comp. by D. N. Bantysh-Kamenskii and published by O. Bodianskii in *Chtenia v Imperatorskom Obshchestve istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh* (hereafter *Istochniki*) (Moscow, 1859), and "Dopros Gertsika ob uchastii ego v izmene Mazepy," *Kievskaia starina*, 1883, no. 3, pp. 603–608.

tiously trying to create suitable conditions for Ukrainian statehood.[8] Imperial Russian and Soviet historians, noting the incontestable evidence of the hetman's egoism and self-seeking, wholly denied his ability to be loyal to anyone or anything except himself.[9] Basically, both sides interpreted these long years of service as a sham and as a cover for ulterior motives.

From Orlyk's account, however, it is clear that although Mazepa did consider his own self-interest and did feel a deep love for "dear, old Ukraine," he was also loyal to the tsar and did not consider these to be mutually exclusive commitments. Indeed, his ability to coordinate these various commitments was the secret of his long years of political success and of his truly harmonious relationship with Peter. By way of example, one might examine this ability to satisfy all sides in the context of the two greatest external problems Mazepa had to deal with prior to the Great Northern War — the Azov Campaign of 1695 and the issue of the Right-Bank Ukraine between 1700 and 1705.

Unlike his predecessors, Mazepa wholeheartedly aided the tsar in his campaign against the Ottomans and Crimean Tatars based at Azov.[10] As a result he earned Peter's goodwill and support and the Ukraine benefited from the campaigns, costly as they were, because they alleviated the perennial threat of the Tatar slave-hunting raids.

The issue of the Right Bank was more complicated; nevertheless, Mazepa's approach was similar.[11] The origins of the problem went back to 1667, when Moscow, to the great chagrin of the current hetman and the Ukrainian populace, returned the Right-Bank Ukraine to Polish control. Much ill will was felt toward Moscow for its role in this matter. For decades thereafter, the cherished dream of Ukrainian hetmans, Cossacks, and peasants alike was to regain the rich land on the Right Bank of the Dnieper. Of all the Ukrainian hetmans, Mazepa came closest to attaining this goal. In 1701, a ferocious uprising of Ukrainian Cossacks living on the Right Bank undermined the Polish hold on the area. Seizing this opportunity, the hetman persuaded Peter to sanction his intervention in the chaos. In 1704, acting in the tsar's name, Mazepa occupied the most

8 Doroshenko, "Mazepa v istorychnii literaturi," p. 20, and Umanets, *Mazepa*, p. 290.
9 Shutoi, "Izmena Mazepy," pp. 158, 162, 171, and Solov'ev, *Istoriia Rossii*, 8: 212.
10 Cf. Kostomarov, *Mazepa*, pp. 121–43.
11 For an interesting treatment of this issue cf. M. Andrusiak, *Mazepa i Pravoberezhiia* (L'viv, 1938).

strategic points on the Right Bank. He thereby extended, as he emphasized in his dispatches to Peter, the tsar's influence and provided him with a trump card in dealing with his intractable Polish allies: if the Poles did not cooperate, they would not get back the Right Bank. For the land-hungry Cossacks and peasants of the Left Bank, this intervention provided an opportunity to pour into the relatively empty lands on the other side of the Dnieper. As for the hetman, his authority and prestige increased tremendously as a result of this seemingly successful solution to an old and burning problem. Again Mazepa was able to satisfy all his commitments and interests, and to appear as "the tsar's most loyal servant and his land's great benefactor."

It is possible, therefore, to take at face value the statement Mazepa made when Charles XII's agents first approached him: "I have grown old in the service of His Majesty, the Tsar.... I am and always have been faithful to the present Tsar, to his brother and to his father. Neither the Polish King, nor the Crimean Khan nor the Don Cossacks could sway me."[12] The focus of these expressions of loyalty, however, merits closer scrutiny. Clearly, the attitude expressed here is a personal and dynastic loyalty, namely, that of a vassal to his sovereign. It is not allegiance to a state. Indeed, in reading Orlyk's account or any of the documents written by Mazepa himself, it is striking that the state never appears as a focus of loyalty. The Ukraine's bonds are always presented as being with the tsar, not with the Russian state.[13]

The nature of the hetman's commitment to his own land should also be examined more closely. On several occasions, he reminded Orlyk that he was working for "all of you who are under my command and rule, for your wives and children, for the welfare of our poor, unfortunate Ukraine, for the entire Zaporozhian Host and the Little Russian people, for the extension and elevation of the Host's rights and liberties."[14] In this

[12] Orlyk to Iavors'kyi, p. 5.

[13] More than fifty years later, these same sentiments were still evident among the Ukrainian *starshyna.* In S. Divovych's well-known "Razgovor Velikoirossii s Malorossieiu" (*Khrestomatiia davnoi Ukrains'koi literatury,* ed. by O. Bilets'kyi, 3rd ed. [Kiev, 1967], p. 474) the theme that the Ukraine accepted the sovereignty of the Russian tsar but not of Russia is stressed repeatedly. "Malorossiia" addresses "Velikarossiia" in this manner:

> No, no, my friend, do not think of me thusly
> My dealings are with the tsar, not with you:
> He took me under his protection as if I were his own
> And he let me keep everything that belonged to me.

[14] Orlyk to Iavors'kyi, p. 13.

case and in many others it is evident that Mazepa's concern is for his *patria* and all its inhabitants — the *starshyna* or Cossack elite that rules the land with him, the Cossack Host or estate, and the rest of the people of "Little Russia." Here as elsewhere, the well-being of the land is identified mainly with the rights and privileges of its leading estate — the Cossacks. Mazepa's words express the love of homeland or patriotism that is so typical of estate-oriented societies. The prime focus of loyalty is territory and the interests of its leading estate. Only then comes concern for other segments of the society. Perhaps it is more important, however, to note what Mazepa's words do not express: they are not expressions of ethnic nationalism or of its concomitant urge for national statehood. Thus, Mazepa's own words give good reason to regard him as a Ukrainian patriot, but little ground on which to consider him a Ukrainian statist.

How, in such a sophisticated political figure as Mazepa, can we account for the lack of awareness of the interests and even of the very existence of Ukrainian, not to mention Russian, statehood? The answer is quite simple: the formation of the state in the sense of an institution distinguishable from the person of the tsar and his domain was, although imminent, not yet a reality in Eastern Europe at the end of the seventeenth century. Therefore, it could hardly have been a part of the hetman's political vocabulary or conceptual framework. This conclusion rests on an overpowering argument: the radical political, institutional, and ideological changes that took place in Russia and in the Ukraine in the latter part of Peter's reign are proof enough that a new type of political formation and political thinking — only now worthy of being called statist rather than patrimonial — had come into being.[15]

[15] German historians have long stressed the newness of the "institutional Flächenstaat." Cf. W. Mager, "Zur Entstehung des modernen Staatsbegriffs," *Mainzer Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur/Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse,* 1968, no. 9, pp. 5–100. Only recently have American historians begun to appreciate the uniqueness of this institution. Cf. C. Tilly, *The Formation of National States in Western Europe* (Princeton, 1975). In regard to Eastern Europe and Russia, it has been pointed out by G. Stökl ("Die Begriffe Reich, Herrschaft und Staat bei den orthodoxen Slawen," *Saeculum,* 1954, pp. 104–117) that the state concept came into widespread usage in Russia only in the latter part of the seventeenth century. A. V. Soloviev, in his "Die Entwicklung der Idee des Staates in den slawische Monarchien" (M. Hellman, ed., *Corona Regni* [Weimar, 1961], pp. 156–98) also points out the underdevelopment of the state concept among the Muscovites, noting that, in contrast to neighboring capitals, in Moscow "the crown was never a symbol of statehood" (p. 197). A Soviet work which emphasizes the qualitative changes introduced by Peter is B. I. Syromiatnikov, *"Reguliarnoe Gosudarstvo" Petra Pervogo i ego ideologiia* (Moscow and Leningrad, 1943).

Such a conclusion completely alters the context in which Mazepa's actions have been traditionally perceived. Previously, his predicament was usually seen in terms of two already full-fledged states, that of the tsars and that of the Ukrainian Cossacks. The latter was subordinated to the former, but it was distinct and autonomous. Each had its own *raison d'etat* and demanded, as states are wont, the undivided loyalty of its servitors. Because of his commitment to both, Mazepa had to walk a thin line, but, sooner or later, he was bound to miss his step. This, it was argued, constituted the tragedy of his situation.

There is, however, another way to interpret Mazepa's dilemma. It was not between the demands and interests of two states that he had to maneuver, but between those of his sovereign and the regional elite of the Ukraine. Although this relationship certainly had its contradictions and tensions, since it was personal rather than institutional, it was not sharply delineated and therefore much more flexible. Nor was it structured in such a way as to force a choice between the interests of the tsar and those of the Ukrainian elite; on the contrary, its goal was to satisfy the interests of both parties.

This was how Mazepa understood the Pereiaslav Agreement, by the terms of which, in 1654, the Ukraine had accepted the overlordship of Peter's father, Alexei Mikhailovich. And it was according to this mutually beneficial understanding of the relationship that he formulated his own policies. Ironically, Mazepa, who has come to symbolize Russian-Ukrainian enmity, was better able to satisfy the interests of both the tsar and the Ukrainian elite than any of his predecessors. His tenure as hetman was not, as is often depicted, a continuous game of hypocrisy and dissimulation, a prelude to treachery or a prolonged and agonizing wavering between the tsar's, his own, and his country's interests. By fulfilling all his commitments so well up to 1708, Mazepa showed that he was a master of the political conventions of his time and land.

An examination of the political conventions that Mazepa followed is essential if one hopes to grasp the motives that led to his decision in 1708. Unfortunately, because of its relatively brief existence as a political entity, the Zaporozhian Host never formulated an explicit statement of its political values.[16] However, in their verbal and political responses to the

[16] The closest we can come to articulated statements of Cossack political values is the Pereiaslav Agreement and the so-called Bender Constitution. For the text of the former and all its variations, see A. Iakovliv, *Ukrains'ko-moskovs'ki dohovory v XVII–XVIII st.*, in vol. 19 of *Pratsi.* The text of the Bender Constitution may be found in *Istochniki,* pp. 242–55. For a discussion and English translation of this document

policies of their Muscovite sovereigns — especially in times of stress or crisis — the hetmans and the Host revealed clearly the political principles to which they adhered.

The crisis that elicited some of the most revealing reactions from the Ukrainian Cossack elite was brought on by the Great Northern War. For the Cossacks, this was a new and harrowing experience. Its depressing length, its arduousness, and its huge human and material losses were painful, but not new, for Mazepa's men. The disquieting novelties of the conflict lay elsewhere. For the first time since accepting the tsar's overlordship, the Cossacks had to march far beyond their own borders, to the distant Baltic shores, there to engage the Swedes, a people with whom they themselves had no quarrel. Previously, they had fought under their own commanders; their armies had operated autonomously, as equals, alongside the Russian armies. In this war, Peter appointed Russians and Germans schooled in modern warfare to lead the Ukrainians. The foreign officers treated the proud Cossacks as inferior military units, often using them as cannon fodder. The Cossacks' own officers were mistreated and insulted by the commanders of the tsar's modernized army.[17] However, what most unnerved and demoralized the Cossacks, especially their officer class, were rumors that the tsar intended to disband the traditional Cossack formations and to reorganize them according to European regimental models. To comprehend the impact of these rumors on the Cossack elite, it is necessary to recall that the Cossacks' military organization corresponded to their socioeconomic structure. To tamper with the former would mean disrupting the latter; it would mean upsetting the established order, that is, the traditional rights and privileges of the Zaporozhian Host that the tsar had agreed to respect at Pereiaslav. And, as far as the hetman and the *starshyna* were concerned, to attack tradition and age-old custom was the greatest wrong anyone, the tsar included, could commit.

As the war and Peter's modernizing progressed, the *starshyna* began to panic. They pressured Mazepa, half-pleading, half-threatening, "Just as we always prayed to God for the soul of Khmel'nyts'kyi and blessed his

---

see M. Vasylenko, "The Constitution of Pylyp Orlyk," in *Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S.*, 6 (1958): 1260–96.

17 This dissatisfaction of the Ukrainian Cossacks was noted many times in the sources. Cf. Orlyk to Iavors'kyi, pp. 3, 6, 10–11, and the manifestos of Charles XII to the Ukrainians in *Istochniki*, pp. 206–212. Polish agents in the Ukraine also commented on this dissatisfaction. See O. Subtelny, ed., *The Letters of Ivan Mazepa* (New York, 1975), p. 113.

name for freeing the Ukraine from the Polish yoke, so we and our children will forever curse your soul and bones if, as a result of your hetmancy, you leave us in such slavery."[18] Mazepa was not about to ignore these pleas; Peter's innovations were also beginning to infringe upon his personal interests. Russian generals had become so audacious as to interfere with Mazepa's authority over his own troops. When he learned of this, the proud old hetman cried out: "Can there be a greater insult, humiliation and mockery of my person than this? Prince Alexei Danielevich [Alexander Menshikov, the Russian commander] visits and converses with me every day...and yet he orders my men about without my knowledge! O Lord, witness my injuries and humiliations!"[19] Only now, with Peter's attack on the traditional order, the maintenance of which constituted the very basis of the Ukraine's relationship to the tsar, did the hetman conclude that he would be unable to reconcile his sovereign's, his own, and his country's interests.

Peter's innovations were forcing the hetman to make a choice. At this vulnerable moment, Charles's agents secretly approached Mazepa. It was not the first time such contacts had been attempted.[20] Earlier, they had been rebuffed. This time, the hetman, still careful not to commit himself, decided to respond more favorably.

The grievance that finally forced Mazepa over to the side of the Swedes involved the issue of protection. In 1707, the Swedes launched their initially successful offensive in the north. Simultaneously, their Polish ally, King Stanisław Leszczyński, moved with his army towards the Ukraine. The possibility of a Swedish victory and of a triumphant return by the Swedes' Polish allies to the Ukraine seemed frighteningly real to the Cossacks. Mazepa, urged on by the *starshyna* and realizing that his troops were too weakened by the Baltic campaigns to withstand the Poles, turned to his sovereign for aid. According to Orlyk, their discussion went as follows:

I proposed to his Tsarist Majesty that, should the Swedish King and Stanisław divide their troops and the former go into the Muscovite realm and the latter into the Ukraine, we, with our weak army, ruined by frequent campaigns and wars, would not be able to defend ourselves against the enemy. Therefore, I requested from his Tsarist Majesty...that he be so pleased as to give us at least 10,000 of his

[18] Orlyk to Iavors'kyi, p. 8.
[19] Orlyk to Iavors'kyi, p. 10.
[20] Cf. Kostomarov, *Mazepa,* p. 278.

regular troops. His Tsarist Majesty replied to me: "Not only 10,000, but I cannot even spare ten men; defend yourself as best you can."[21]

For Mazepa, this was the last straw. Confronted with the threat of a Polish invasion, a disaster which would not only devastate the land but also destroy the Cossack order established more than fifty years earlier, the faithful vassal received from his sovereign a blunt refusal of aid. To be sure, Peter had, first and foremost, to care for his own lands. But this was just the point: an insurmountable distinction had been drawn between the interests of the tsar and those of the hetman. For the hetman this meant that the Pereiaslav Agreement—the basis of his loyalty to the tsar—was no longer mutually beneficial and, therefore, no longer binding.

Immediately after his conversation with the tsar, the hetman began to negotiate seriously with Charles and his Polish allies. He did so hesitatingly, with a touch of regret:

> If they [the Poles and Swedes] see an inclination on my part towards them, then they will not treat us as enemies and they will not ravage unfortunate Ukraine with fire and sword. I will, however, remain constant in my loyalty to his Tsarist Majesty until I see with what forces Stanisław will come to Ukraine's borders and what kind of progress the Swedish armies will continue to make in Muscovy. If we will not have the strength to defend Ukraine and ourselves, why should we go to our doom and doom our Motherland as well? God and the entire world will see that we had to do this out of necessity, striving as a free and unconquered people for the means of self-preservation. But, unless the necessity is most pressing and extreme, I will not alter my loyalty to his Tsarist Majesty.[22]

By October 1708, however, it had become impossible to equivocate any longer. Charles, finding the going difficult in Muscovy, suddenly veered south and marched towards the Ukraine. The Ukrainian hetman had to choose either to remain loyal to Peter and face the complete destruction of his land and of the Cossack order by the Swedes and especially their Polish allies, or, for the sake of self-preservation, to side with Charles. The choice he made is well known. Within days, it became apparent that his decision had been the wrong one. With unexpected swiftness, Menshikov and his Russian troops descended upon the Hetmanate before the arrival of the Swedes. Baturyn, the hetman's beloved residence town, was burned to the ground and its population and garrison were massacred.

[21] Orlyk to Iavors'kyi, p. 14. Mazepa's dissatisfaction about the withdrawal of troops from the Ukraine may be seen in his correspondence with the tsar. Peter to Mazepa, 20 September 1708, *Pis'ma i bumagi Imperatora Petra Velikogo* (hereafter *Pis'ma i bumagi*), vol. 8 (Moscow and Leningrad, 1948), no. 1, p. 153.

[22] Orlyk to Iavors'kyi, p. 15.

The majority of Ukrainian Cossacks, frightened by the example set at Baturyn, wavered. Then, the Swedish campaign began to bog down and the Cossacks sided with the tsar. Shortly after the destruction of Baturyn, Mazepa returned with his Swedish allies to its site. As he gazed mournfully at the smouldering ruins, he again tried to justify his actions:

Our start is poor and unfortunate. It appears that God has not blessed my intentions. Yet I swear to that same God that I did not desire the spilling of Christian blood. After returning to Baturyn with the Swedish King, I intended to write a letter to his Tsarist Majesty expressing our gratefulness and listing all our previous and current grievances: the privileges that had been curtailed and the impending destruction that faced the entire population. In conclusion, [I intended] to declare that we, having voluntarily acquiesced to the authority of his Tsarist Majesty for the sake of the unified Eastern Faith, now, being a free people, we wish to withdraw, with expressions of our gratitude for the Tsar's protection and not wishing to raise our hands in the shedding of Christian blood. We will look forward, under the protection of the Swedish King, to our complete liberation.[23]

Mazepa's line of argument is striking in how often certain phrases and ideas are repeated and stressed: rights and privileges; overlordship freely chosen and open to recall; and protection, always the issue of protection. For anyone with an acquaintance with medieval political theory, these concepts strike a familiar note. They are the components of the contractual principle, European feudalism's most common regulator of the political relations between sovereigns and regional elites. One needs only to recall the basic elements of this principle, so widespread and so cherished by the nobilities of seventeenth-century Europe, to see how it coincided with the thrust of Mazepa's arguments.[24]

The contractual arrangement was an act of mutual obligation. The vassal promised his lord obedience, service, and loyalty in return for the latter's protection and respect for the vassal's privileges and the traditions of his land. If the vassal had good reason to believe that his lord was breaking his obligations, he had the right — the famous *ius resistendi* — to rise against him to protect his interests. Thus, in theory, the lord as well as the vassal could be guilty of disloyalty.[25] Throughout Europe, the con-

23 Orlyk to Iavors'kyi, p. 24.
24 For two penetrating articles on this topic see O. Brunner, "Die Freiheitsrechte in der altständischen Gesellschaft," in *Verfassung und Landesgeschichte: Festschrift für Th. Mayer* I (1954): 294–303, and W. Näf, "Herrschaftsverträge und Lehre vom Herrschaftsvertrag," *Schweizer Beiträge zur Allgemeinen Geschichte* 7 (1949): 26–52.
25 Cf. F. Kern, *Gottesgnadentum und Widerstandsrecht im frühen Mittelalter* (Leipzig, 1914). Accusations that the Muscovite tsars were disloyal to their Ukrainian

tractual principle rested on the prevailing cornerstone of legal and moral authority—custom. The German *Schwabenspiegel,* one of the primary sources for customary law in East Central Europe, provided a concise summary of the principle: "We should serve our sovereigns because they protect us, but if they will no longer defend us, then we owe them no more service."[26] Mazepa's position could not have been stated more succinctly.

Besides the hetman's own words, what other evidence is there that Mazepa and part of the Cossack elite viewed their relationship to the tsar in terms of the contractual principle? The evidence is circumstantial, but nonetheless convincing. First of all, the legal system of the Cossack Ukraine, and the system that the tsars regularly agreed to respect, was based on customary law, essentially Germanic in origin, a basic component of which was the contractual principle.[27] Secondly, and more specific, is a remark by Pylyp Orlyk to the effect that, as the Cossack elite grew dissatisfied with the tsar, they began to study carefully the Hadiach Pact, an agreement negotiated (but never enacted) with the Poles in 1658. Here, too, the relationship with the sovereign was regulated by the contractual principle.[28] Finally, the principle was also evident in 1654 when, during the signing of the Pereiaslav Agreement, Hetman Khmel'nyts'kyi, having sworn allegiance to the tsar, demanded that Alexei Mikhailovich also swear an oath to uphold his part of the arrangement. The Muscovite envoys adamantly refused to take the oath, but they did agree to what was in effect a quid-pro-quo arrangement: the Cossacks' rights and privileges were guaranteed in return for their promise of support and obedience to the tsar.[29]

---

subjects were made by Vyhovs'kyi, Doroshenko, and Mnohohrishnyi. M. Hrushevs'kyi, "Vyhovs'kyi i Mazepa," *Literaturno-naukovyi vistnyk* (L'viv) 4 (1909): 417–29.

26 Cf. E. Nowak, "Die Verbreitung und Anwendung des Sachsenspiegels" (Ph.D. diss., University of Hamburg, 1965). Nowak discusses at some length the widespread use of this germanic compendium of customary laws in Eastern Europe.

27 Cf. A. Jakovliv, *Das Deutsche Recht in der Ukraine und seine Einflüsse auf das ukrainische Recht im 16–18 Jahrhundert* (Leipzig, 1942), p. 15, where he states that "by the end of the seventeenth century, in all the Ukrainian lands that had belonged to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, eventually a system of local self-government developed that was based on German law." Also see M. Vladimirskii-Budanov, "Nemetskoe pravo v Pol'she i Litve," *Zhurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosveshcheniia* (hereafter *ZhMNP*), 1868, pp. 519–86, 722–833. D. Bagalei, "Magdeburgskoe pravo v gorodakh Levoberezhnoi Malorossii," *ZhMNP,* 1892, pp. 1–56.

28 Orlyk to Iavors'kyi, p. 11. "... They [the *starshyna*] met daily in the house of the *polkovnyk* of Myrhorod where they considered the means of their self-preservation and read the Hadiach Pacts."

29 For a thorough and non-partisan review of the many different opinions expressed about the nature of the Pereiaslav Treaty, see O. E. Gunther, "Der Vertrag von

From these facts one can conclude that not only Mazepa, but also most of his predecessors viewed their relationship with the tsar in terms of the contractual principle. The defection of Mazepa and the *starshyna* in 1708, therefore, was not an aberration. It was a type of behavior often evinced by regional elites toward sovereigns who were unwilling or unable to keep their part of the political bargain. Why, then, has Mazepa been singled out as the archtraitor, the epitome of treason? To understand this it is necessary to examine the tsar's point of view.

III

It was with "great wonderment" that Peter learned of the "deed of the new Judas, Mazepa, who after twenty-one years of loyalty to me and with one foot already in the grave, turned traitor and betrayer of his people."[30] Such ire was understandable; for months it appeared that the defection would have catastrophic strategic and political consequences for the tsar's war effort. After the victory at Poltava the danger passed, but Peter's anger did not. His authority had been seriously challenged and the culprit had gone unpunished. Worse still, Mazepa continued to argue his case, flooding the Ukraine with numerous proclamations and manifestos. Clearly, Mazepa and, even more important, his claims had to be destroyed.

In November 1708, the tsar's men mounted an intense propaganda campaign in the Ukraine.[31] It was highlighted by two remarkable and, for the Ukraine, unprecedented events. On November 5, in the town of Hlukhiv, many of the *starshyna* who had not followed Mazepa were

---

Pereiaslav im Widerstreit der Meinungen," *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas*, 1954, no. 2, pp. 232–57. Also see H. Fleischhacker, "Aleksei Mikhailovich und Bogdan Chmel'nickij," *Jahrbücher für Kultur und Geschichte der Slaven*, n.s. 9 (1935): 11–52.

[30] Peter to F. M. Apraksin, 30 October 1708, *Pis'ma i bumagi*, vol. 8, no. 1, doc. 2786, p. 253. Although there is some debate about Mazepa's age, most historians agree that he was more than seventy years old in 1708. Cf. B. Krupnyts'kyi, "Miscellanea Mazepiana," *Pratsi* 48: 88–92.

[31] The propaganda war between Mazepa and Peter was treated by B. Kentrschynskyj, "Propagandakriget i Ukraina, 1708–1709," in *Karolinska Förbundets Årsbok* (Stockholm, 1958), pp. 81–124. An English language summary of this article may be found in the *Ukrainian Quarterly* 15 (1959): 241–59. Also see O. Hrushevs'kyi, "Hlukhiv i Lebedyn," *ZNTSh* 92: 21–65, and V. E. Shutoi, "O pismakh naseleniia Ukrainy russkomu pravitel'stvu v sviazi s izmenoi Mazepy," *Istoriia SSR*, 1961, no. 2, pp. 163–70. The texts of Peter's manifestos to the Ukrainian populace may be found in *Pis'ma i bumagi*, vol. 8, no. 1, docs. 2760–2763, 2767–2783, 2791–2794. Some of the propaganda literature issued by Mazepa and Charles XII was published in Bantysh-Kamenskii's *Istochniki*, pp. 173–75 and 205–206. Also cf. Solov'ev, *Istoriia Rossii*, 8: 250–53 and 263–65.

hastily assembled. Under the gaze of Russian troops, they elected Ivan Skoropads'kyi their new hetman. In the midst of the proceedings, the Russian commanders, Princes Menshikov and Golovkin, had a large platform built in the center of town. On it a gallows was erected. Then, to the sound of rolling drums, an effigy of Mazepa, the coveted cross of St. Andrew dangling from its breast, was dragged through the mud and up to the platform. After reading a lengthy account of the favors the tsar had bestowed upon the Ukrainians and castigating Mazepa's treacherous ingratitude, Menshikov tore the order from the effigy and had the figure hanged from the gallows.

A week later, another ceremony took place in Hlukhiv. This time, Peter and his entire entourage were present; they had come to install the newly-elected hetman. A special proclamation by the tsar ordered all the major Ukrainian hierarchs to attend. After the installation, the entire assembly filed into church and listened, in a haze of incense and to the sound of solemn hymns, as the name of Mazepa was thrice declared anathema. That same day, in the Uspenskii sobor in Moscow, in the presence of the tsarevich and all the leading boyars, Stefan Iavors'kyi, once a close friend of Mazepa's and now the highest-ranking churchman in the realm, performed a similar ceremony. The effect of these ceremonies was widespread. Large segments of the Ukrainian population joined in the chorus of condemnation. For centuries to come, imperial peasants would not mention the name of Mazepa without appending to it the epithet "the accursed," and every year until 1869, on the first Sunday of the Great Fast, the ritual of Mazepa's anathematization would be repeated in all the churches of the empire.[32]

But it is not so much the immediate impact of these two ceremonies as their implications which are of interest here. Associated with each is an unarticulated but potent argument (and in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Ukraine, ceremonies transmitted messages much more effectively than did manifestos) for Peter's claims to sovereignty in the Ukraine and, by extension, for his castigation of Mazepa. It is worthwhile, therefore, to

32 For a discussion of this ceremony from the point of view of canon law, see O. Lotots'kyi, "Sprava pravosyl'nosty anatemuvannia het'mana Ivana Mazepy," *Pratsi* 48: 57–68. The same volume (pp. 38–56) also contains V. Bidnov's detailed description of the ceremony of anathematization. In Pushkin's *Poltava* we read:

zabyt Mazepa s davnikh por;
lish v torzhestvuiushchei sviatyne
raz v god anafemoi donyne,
grozia, gremit o nëm sobor.

probe more deeply into the significance of these ceremonies, turning first to the elaborate and widely publicized anathematization.

It was neither the first nor the last time that Russian monarchs had the Orthodox Church condemn to eternal damnation those who dared defy them. But rarely, if ever, was the ceremony of anathematization carried out as elaborately. We know, of course, that this religious extravaganza had a propagandistic function. It might also be regarded as yet another reflection of tsardom's theocratic nature. But, for the sake of analysis, the ceremony's greatest significance was that it highlighted a point all too many nationalist and Marxist historians tend to forget: the central role that Orthodoxy played in creating and maintaining the relationship between the tsar and the Zaporozhian Host.

When, in 1654, a hesitant Tsar Alexei Mikhailovich asked the Zemskii sobor whether to enter into an arrangement with the Ukrainian Cossacks, the sobor advised him to do so "for the sake of the unified Orthodox faith." And so the tsar's writ to Khmel'nyts'kyi read:

> We, the Great Sovereign, for the glory of the Orthodox Christian faith and the holy Churches of God and for no other purpose save this, that all true believing Orthodox Christians be liberated from Latin persecutions and oppressions, have accepted you under our sovereign hand.[33]

Khmel'nyts'kyi answered in kind. Of the four sovereigns considered— the Polish king, the Ottoman sultan, the Crimean khan, and the Muscovite tsar—he chose the last because, in his own words,

> The Orthodox Christian Sovereign, the Tsar of the East, is one with us in the practice of the Greek Faith; through the Orthodox faith of Great Rus' we are all members of one Church whose head is Jesus Christ.[34]

Fifty-four years later, Mazepa himself also stressed that "It was for the sake of the unified Eastern Orthodox faith that we, a free people, acknowledged the high hand of the Tsar."[35] These words were not mere rhetoric. It is well known how crucial the defense of Orthodoxy had been in fueling Khmel'nyts'kyi's uprising, how Orthodoxy pervaded Muscovite thinking, and what role religion in general played in the politics—especially in the relations between sovereigns and regional elites—and in the wars of seventeenth-century Europe. Orthodoxy, therefore, provided the framework for the agreement reached at Pereiaslav.

There were obviously other, more pragmatic, motives for establishing

[33] *Vossoedinenie Ukrainy s Rossiei* (Moscow, 1954), vol. 3, doc. 205, p. 461.
[34] *Vossoedinenie Ukrainy s Rossiei*, vol. 3, doc. 205, p. 461.
[35] Orlyk to Iavors'kyi, p. 24.

the relationship with the tsar. The Cossacks expected their new Muscovite sovereign to recognize what their previous Polish sovereign had denied them — their status as the new elite in the Ukraine. For his part, the tsar found it difficult to let such an opportunity for extending his sovereignty over a vast and wealthy land pass by. From the outset, both sides realized that, in terms of political traditions, they represented two different worlds: the Ukrainian Cossacks were the products of the Polish-Lithuanian "gentry republic" where the inviolability of the elite's rights was the dominant principle, while the tsar was heir to an uncompromising tradition of absolute rule. But, in 1654, both Hetman Khmel'nyts'kyi and Tsar Alexei Mikhailovich felt that they had more to gain by stressing what united, rather than what divided them: hence, the focus on Orthodoxy.

By and large, the importance of Orthodoxy in the relationship rebounded in favor of the tsars. It is well known that in the Russian political tradition, Orthodoxy had long been interwoven with autocracy. Therefore, as the tsars slowly and methodically chipped away at the rights and privileges of the Ukrainian Cossacks, they argued that this was being done not so much for political motives as for the sake of the common faith.

We now return to 1708. Predictably, if paradoxically, the notoriously irreligious Peter used Orthodoxy to condemn Mazepa, portraying the old hetman's actions as, first and foremost, a betrayal of the common faith. It was this point that the ceremony of anathematization was to sear into the minds of the Ukrainians. This betrayal-of-Orthodoxy theme was reiterated constantly in the flood of tsarist propaganda literature that inundated the Ukraine prior to Poltava. Poems, songs, and leaflets repeated and elaborated it: by going over to the Swedes and Poles, Mazepa planned to establish the hated Uniate Church in the Ukraine; he had secretly become a Catholic himself; and he had allowed the Swedes to desecrate Orthodox churches by quartering their horses there.[36] Meanwhile, Peter's conflict with the Lutheran Swedes and Catholic Poles was

[36] The most complete collection of these poems and songs may be found in S. Shcheholova, "Virshi pro Mazepu," *Naukovyi zbirnyk Ukrains'koi Akademii nauk* 21 (1926): 82–111. Some of these songs were also published in *Istochniki*, pp. 238–41. Also see M. Drahomanov, ed., *Politychni pisni ukrains'koho narodu*, vol. 2 (Geneva, 1885), and Solov'ev, *Istoriia Rossii*, 8: 250–53. The broad circulation of this propaganda literature may be seen from the large numbers of pamphlets and proclamations that were published. Peter's proclamation of 6 November 1708 appeared in almost 5,000 copies: *250 rokiv poltavs'koi bytvy* (Kiev, 1959), p. 94.

pictured primarily as a defense of Orthodoxy. As foreign observers in Moscow noted, such arguments could be devastatingly effective "among a people so bigoted in their faith as were the Cossacks."[37]

Mazepa attempted a similar reply. At his urging, Charles XII circulated rumors about the tsar's alleged plans to introduce Catholicism into the Ukraine. As proof of these allegations, the hetman pointed to Peter's invitation to the Jesuits to establish schools in Russia and to his alleged negotiations with the pope. A large number of the hetman's agents mingled with the populace and attempted to convince them that their master had "acted for the sake of the faith."[38] However, compromised by his associations with the Lutherans and Catholics, Mazepa, once his land's most generous patron of the Church, now found himself very much at a disadvantage in this contest of holier-than-thous.

But the tsar, too, had problems in arguing his case. Some of the strongest accusations that he hurled against Mazepa had their limitations when applied in the Ukraine. A major complication arose from the Muscovite conception of treason and its impact, or rather, lack of impact, among the Ukrainians. Since the *Ulozhenie* of 1649, Muscovy had a legal definition of treason (*izmena*). And yet the tsar seemed wary of referring to it throughout his campaign. It might be argued that because the Ukrainians were judged by their own laws, the *Ulozhenie*'s effect in their land, even in matters of treason, was limited. But this was only part of the problem; its essence lay elsewhere. The *Ulozhenie* defined treason as primarily a crime against the person and rule of the tsar. It did not mention the state as an object of the crime.[39] Thus, the generally conceived notion of treason as a public crime, one directed against the interests of society or state, did not coincide with the personally oriented (but widely applied) Muscovite conception of *izmena*. For the pre-Petrine

[37] Cf. B. Krupnyts'kyi, "Z donesen' Kaizerlinga, 1708–1709," *Pratsi* 47: 28. This comment was attributed to the Prussian envoy to Moscow, Johann Freiherr von Kayserling.

[38] Solov'ev, *Istoriia Rossii,* 8: 252, and *Istochniki,* p. 173.

[39] See V. Glötzner, *Die strafrechtliche Terminologie des Ulozhenie, 1649* (Wiesbaden, 1967), especially his statement that "*Izmena* ist aber nicht als ein delikt gegen den Staat anzusehen, sondern als ein solches gegen die Majestät des Caren" (p. 70). For the development of *izmena* in the sense of personal disloyalty, see O. Backus, "Treason as a Concept and Defections to Lithuania in the Sixteenth Century," *Forschungen zur osteuropäischen Geschichte* 5 (1970): 118–44. A perceptive discussion of Peter's attempt to draw a distinction between the person of the ruler and the state is M. Cherniavsky's *Tsar and People: Studies in Russian Myths* (New York, 1961), pp. 72–95.

period, the terms "breach of faith" or "betrayal" reflect the meaning of *izmena* more accurately than does "treason."

How would the Ukrainians, who had only recently rejected one sovereign and among whom the hetmans assumed sole responsibility for relations with the tsars, react to the Muscovite accusations of *izmena?* They certainly would not stand in such awe of the transgression as was characteristic of their Muscovite neighbors. Strongly influenced by the feudalism of the *Rzeczpospolita,* the Ukrainians tended to perceive conflicts between tsars and hetmans as a falling-out between overlords and not as matters which directly involved the general populace. It should, after all, be kept in mind that feudal and/or patrimonial politics are, by definition, personal politics.

Such an indifferent attitude on the part of the Ukrainians to Muscovite accusations of betrayal was demonstrated to the tsars, with frustrating regularity, up to the time of Poltava. Almost every one of Mazepa's predecessors had been called a traitor by his Muscovite sovereign,[40] but the accusations had had little effect on the hetman's supporters or on the rest of Ukrainian society. Even in so blatant a case as that of Hetman Vyhovs'kyi, who, in 1659, not only rejected the tsar's sovereignty and sought to return to that of the Polish king, but also destroyed the Muscovite army sent to restrain him, the label of traitor did not stick in the popular consciousness. Tsar Alexei Mikhailovich did not try to make an "ideological" issue of this matter, as his son did later in the case of Mazepa.[41] Realizing that the patrimonially oriented Muscovite conception of *izmena* was hardly potent enough to mobilize the Ukrainian masses to reject or to condemn those who had been accused of the crime, Peter emphasized the hetman's alleged betrayal of Orthodoxy. But even this approach, with all its advantages, carried serious liabilities for tsarist autocracy in the Ukraine.

For a ruler who wanted to break with the past as much as he did, Peter's reliance on religious arguments had a most inconvenient aspect: in the Ukraine, Orthodoxy was also tightly interwoven with political values. There, however, these values were not those of autocracy, as in Muscovy, but rather, those of Cossack rights and liberties. Indeed, the combination of Orthodoxy and corporate rights had been the essence of Cossackdom

[40] Cf. M. Vasylenko, "Teplov i ioho 'Zapiska o neporiadkakh v Malorossii,'" *Zapysky Ukrains'koho naukovoho tovarystva v Kyivi* 9 (1911): 13–23.
[41] For a comparison of Mazepa's and Vyhovs'kyi's relations with the tsars, see Hrushevs'kyi, "Vyhovs'kyi i Mazepa."

during its formative period in the Catholic and gentry-dominated Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Generation after generation of Ukrainian Cossacks identified and equated their socioeconomic and political rights with the welfare of their faith. So firmly rooted was this association in the Ukrainian Cossack consciousness that Peter dared not ignore it. Every time he stressed his defense of Orthodoxy in the Ukraine, he felt constrained to emphasize also his respect for Cossack rights and liberties. For example, one of his manifestos reads:

> We can without shame assert that no people under the sun can boast of their liberty and privileges more than the Little Russian people under our rule.... With our troops, maintained at our own expense, we defend the Little Russian land, the Holy Orthodox Church and monasteries, the towns, and the villages from the onslaught of the Muslim and the heretics.[42]

Also:

> They [the Ukrainian Cossacks] know... that since they came under the high hand of the tsars they have enjoyed great liberties and privileges both in their worldly affairs and especially in the practice of their faith.[43]

Thus, his appeal to Orthodoxy, for all its advantages, placed Peter in an uncomfortable position: in using it to condemn Mazepa, he was also forced to acknowledge repeatedly the sanctity of Ukrainian rights. And these, even more than the hetman himself, were the major stumbling block to the changes he wanted to impose. Clearly, what Peter needed was an altogether different basis for defining his authority in the Ukraine.

The bizarre ceremony of Mazepa's defamation, too, was an unprecedented event in the Ukraine. For the first time, the tsar condemned the memory of a Ukrainian rebel in secular rather than religious terms. To grasp the significance of this ceremony it is useful to consider its origins. The practice can be traced back to Republican Rome, where such sanctions were imposed on those who had committed public crimes and had managed to escape. By damning the memory of such individuals — the ceremony itself could take various forms — the Romans proclaimed that a crime against the public interest had been committed and that, as such, it could not go unpunished, even if the reprisal were purely symbolic. Reflected in such ceremonies was the Romans' consciousness of political crime, that is, of crimes against the state, since it was the institution that

[42] "Ukaz vsemu malorossiiskomu narodu," 6 November 1708, *Pis'ma i bumagi*, vol. 8, no. 1, doc. 2816, p. 276.

[43] *Pis'ma i bumagi*, vol. 8, no. 1, doc. 2816, p. 283.

represented the common interest.[44] Along with Roman law, this procedure was preserved in Western Europe until the rise of the absolutist state, when it again found widespread application. And from the West, we may assume, it found its way, along with such concepts as the senate and such titles as *imperator, pater patriae* (*otets otchestva*) and *maximus* (*velikii*), to Petrine Russia.[45] From this it is evident that the carefully staged event in Hlukhiv was more than just an effective piece of showmanship or propaganda; it was Peter's way of introducing the Ukrainians to the concept of the public or political crime.[46]

If the idea of the political crime was just being introduced, then the notion of statehood in the sense of a suprapersonal institution must also have beer of recent origin. It has already been noted that only in the late seventeenth or early eighteenth century did such a conception of statehood appear in Russia.[47] Peter, by means of intuitive, ad hoc applications of Western techniques of war and government rather than conscious, long-range planning, set out to transform this rather vaguely perceived conception into reality. And it was he—in the context of the Northern War and the well-orchestrated furor over Mazepa's defection—who first applied the values and practices of the unitary state to what had previously been a personal relationship between the Muscovite tsar and the regional elite of the Ukraine.

There were other indications that signaled Peter's intent to introduce an entirely new set of political concepts into his dealings with the Ukrainians. Shortly before Mazepa's defection, the tsar's letters to the hetman showed a dramatic increase in the use of such phrases as "common interest (*dlia obshchikh interesov*)" and the introduction of completely new phrases such as "the common interest of the state (*dlia obshchei gosudarstvennoi pol'zy*)," two phrases which the tsar used interchangeably.[48]

44 For a discussion of the connection between the damnation of memory and crimes against the state, see T. Mommsen, *Römisches Strafrecht* (Leipzig, 1899), pp. 591, 987, and especially 990.

45 See Wladimir Weidle, *Russia: Absent and Present* (New York, 1952), p. 43, and, more recently, Stephen L. Baehr, "From History to National Myth: *Translatio imperii* in Eighteenth Century Russia," *Russian Review* 37 (January 1978): 2–3.

46 For related developments in Russia, see Richard Pipes, *Russia under the Old Regime* (London, 1974), pp. 129–30.

47 Stökl, "Die Begriffe Reich," p. 117; and Pipes, *Russia under the Old Regime*, who states that "it was under Peter that there emerges in Russia a sense of the state as something distinct from and superior to the monarch" (p. 128).

48 For example, see Peter to Mazepa, 24 June 1707, and 10 October 1708, in *Istochniki*, pp. 57 and 162. The relationship between Peter's idea of the "common

It was not the new phrases themselves that Mazepa found so foreboding, but the purposes to which they were applied. Every time the hetman complained about yet another demand or exaction that the tsar had imposed, Peter invariably replied that this was necessary "for the common state interest." Sometimes the tsar added that "this was a cause for which we, sharing in all the difficulties, do not spare even our own person."[49] For a patrimonially-minded ruler such a self-effacing statement would have been impossible; it did, however, befit a monarch who saw himself as the first servant of the state. Only days before Mazepa joined the Swedes, the tsar demanded that Cossacks be sent to Russia even though this meant that the Ukraine would be left defenseless, because "common interest" necessitated such a move. Nor did Peter lose time in initiating Skoropads'kyi, the newly-elected hetman, into his new way of thinking. When Skoropads'kyi turned to the tsar for the customary confirmation of Ukrainian rights and privileges, the latter acquiesced, but added one new and crucial stipulation: these rights were to be respected "except in cases of conflict with matters of the state such as treason."[50] Thus, not only was the concept of political crime and *raison d'etat* introduced into the Ukraine, but it was given priority over the traditional rights of the land and its elite.

The usefulness of this new concept for condemning Mazepa and all that he represented was immediately apparent to the tsar. Common interest, the public welfare, and *raison d'etat*—these were the elements of a rationale that could transform the hetman's defection from an act whose impact was limited to the interests of the tsar into one of widespread concern and condemnation. By identifying himself with these slogans, the tsar would appear as the champion of all his subjects, Russians and Ukrainians alike, while Mazepa could easily be depicted as caring only for his own personal interests or for those of a selfish elite. More important, these slogans, unlike those associated with Orthodoxy, allowed Peter to deal more readily with the heart of the problem, namely, the issue of Ukrainian rights and liberties. An attack on custom in traditional societies always entails great risk, but this risk can be appreciably reduced if one argues that the act is for the sake of the general welfare. Peter made good use of this argument. With great consistency and effectiveness, he

---

good" and his state-building activities is discussed by Pipes, *Russia under the Old Regime,* p. 128.

[49] *Istochniki,* p. 57.

[50] "Reshitelnoi ukaz velikogo gosudaria," 31 July 1709, *Pis'ma i bumagi,* 9, no. 1:321.

used the rationale of public interest to isolate and undermine the defenders of custom and tradition, and he transformed that rationale into a broad and flexible basis for his pursuit in the Ukraine of the interests of his new state.

IV

To summarize, Mazepa perceived loyalty to and relations with the tsar essentially in terms of the contractual principle. In fact, it was in the Ukraine that this all-European concept found its easternmost extension. The Ukrainian *starshyna,* which consciously copied the legalistic preoccupations of the Polish *szlachta* and knew well the terms of the Pereiaslav Agreement, had a highly developed sense of its rights (unlike the Russian elite, which had no such formal agreement with the tsar to which it could refer). In this context, politics meant primarily the maintenance of the quid-pro-quo arrangement between the sovereign and the regional elite. As long as Peter and his predecessors protected the lands and respected the rights of the Zaporozhian Host, they could demand its obedience and military service and even impose certain autocratic forms ("granting" rather than guaranteeing the Ukrainians their traditional rights). When they failed to do so, however, the hetmans usually felt justified in breaking or attempting to break off the relationship. The bond with the tsar was seen in static, traditionalistic terms, and the focus of loyalty was the person of the tsar. This, in brief, was the view of Mazepa, his predecessors, and his supporters.

Peter, on the other hand, could avail himself of two lines of argument in basing his demands for Ukrainian loyalty. First, he had at his disposal the traditional patrimonial theocratic rationale of the Muscovite tsars: anyone who acknowledged the tsar's sovereignty was considered to be part of the tsar's personal domain within which there could be no limits on the latter's prerogatives. Any rights or privileges the subject enjoyed had no other source than the tsar's generosity, and they could be revoked or limited as the tsar saw fit. Because the Orthodox Church sanctified this view, any protest against it was deemed to be a grievous sin against the faith.

This view, however, was more absolutist in theory than in practice. At least, this was the case during the seventeenth century when, after the Time of Troubles, Muscovite autocratic forms possessed varying degrees of autocratic content. When dealing with such a militarily powerful and culturally relatively advanced land as the Ukraine—one which, it is

important to note, had accepted the tsar's sovereignty voluntarily—the Muscovite rulers had to make concessions, if not in their autocratic principles, then in the application of these. At Pereiaslav, therefore, they agreed to respect Ukrainian rights and privileges. While for the tsars this was basically a tactical maneuver, the Ukrainians considered these concessions an acknowledgment of their political principles. This ambiguity, encouraged by a common faith and personalism in political relations, allowed each side to believe that its own view had been accepted by the other. In this manner, Muscovite patrimonial and Ukrainian contractual views managed to coexist for over half a century.

The second theoretical basis for demanding Ukrainian loyalty—and it should be stressed again that it was put forward haphazardly, intuitively, and in bits and snatches—was a Petrine innovation: it rested on the concept of the state. In his correspondence with Mazepa, Peter implied that the state was an institution which could rationally and efficiently serve the welfare of all his subjects, Ukrainians included. But, to do so, the state must command, in fact as well as in theory, the unconditional loyalty of its subjects. This formulation had two results: an institution became the focus of loyalty, and the ambiguity stemming from personally defined political relationships was removed. The state could not tolerate such loosely defined arrangements as that of Pereiaslav.

Seen in this context, what role does the persistent association of Mazepa with treason play? Historians, as we have seen, have allowed ideological considerations to influence their views on this question. But it was already Mazepa's contemporaries who interpreted his action in terms of treason. Why should a traditionalist like Mazepa, who thought and acted much like his predecessors (only more effectively), be singled out by his contemporaries as the incarnation of treason? Granted, the dramatic circumstances surrounding the deed, the totally unexpected reversal of his role, the towering stature of the ruler he opposed, and the unprecedented propaganda campaign all helped to cast him and his act in bold relief. Yet, these circumstances alone do not explain why treason was so effectively and extensively associated with his name.

Nor is the answer simply a matter of Mazepa's immeasurable guilt. The notorious relativism of treason renders such an explanation fruitless. One can always argue, as did Mazepa and his predecessors, that, in terms of their own political values, it was the tsar who had been disloyal to his agreement to respect Ukrainian rights. If, on the other hand, Peter's statist values are applied, the burden of guilt falls on Mazepa. In

Mazepa's case, therefore, the charge of treason does not so much reflect guilt as it identifies the winner and the loser in a political struggle.

The functions of treason are manifold. When it flares up as a controversial issue, it is an indication that abrupt and radical political upheavals are taking place in the body politic. Treason need not be merely a symptom, however. It often serves as the midwife of radical change. "Betrayal," it has been said, "provides the dynamic factor by means of which a static order is transformed."[51] How could Peter introduce his reforms in the Ukraine if he did not first renege on the commitments made at Pereiaslav? And, in defending Ukrainian rights, could Mazepa have done otherwise than to break with the tsar and go over to his enemies? In both cases disloyalty was unavoidable. And, at the time, as in all times of radical change when much hangs in the balance, it was especially reprehensible. Thus, it was not so much the intrinsic criminality of Mazepa's action—for every hetman up to Skoropads'kyi felt that he had the right to act similarly when the terms of the Pereiaslav Agreement were broken—but the new context of the all-Russian state imposed by Peter that explains why the stigma of treason clings much more tenaciously to Mazepa than to his predecessors.

To conclude, in the association of treason with the state—the two concepts are interdependent—we have the key to Mazepa's association with the crime. When the issue of treason comes to the fore, so does that of the state and its prerogatives. When there is an unprecedented stress on treason, by the same token, there is also an unprecedented consciousness of the state. Therefore, by repeatedly charging Mazepa with treason, Peter was not attempting merely to establish guilt or to make propaganda; he was imposing on the Ukrainians a new set of values—those of the state—and judging them by it. The issue of Mazepa's treason marked the point when the conception of the all-Russian state as an institution capable of encompassing both societies had entered the Ukrainian-Russian relationship.

Hamilton College

51 Carl J. Friedrich, *The Pathology of Politics* (New York, 1972), p. 81.

ARTICLES

PROTESTANTS IN THE UKRAINE DURING THE PERIOD OF THE POLISH-LITHUANIAN COMMONWEALTH (*continued*)*

GEORGE H. WILLIAMS

III. PROTESTANTISM IN THE UKRAINE, 1569/77–1699

Retrospect and Introduction

The preceding part of our narrative followed the Judaizing currents of several kinds flowing into the Ukraine from Novgorod and Moscow by way of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, and the Reformed currents from the West flowing into Poland and Lithuania as Lutheranism. It also dealt with the Reformed movement, which split into the Calvinist Major and the proto-Unitarian Minor Church, 1563 to 1565, and with Anabaptism. All these latter-day reformed groups moved in alongside the Protestantizing Czech Brethren who had penetrated Poland and Lithuania before the Reformation era. All proselytized among the Catholics or the Orthodox of the confessionally already sharply divided Commonwealth.

In the Grand Duchy the first Lutherans had gathered possibly in 1520, most certainly by 1527, in Vilnius. In Poland the first Reformed Church to have a church edifice was that under Pastor Francis Stancaro at Pińczów in 1550. The first synod of the Reformed Church in the Grand Duchy took place in Vilnius in 1557. By 1565 the schismatic Minor Reformed Church in Poland and the Grand Duchy was beginning to polarize around the issue of the legitimacy of adoring Christ as fully human, a controversy which had its counterpart in the schism in the Unitarian Reformed Church in Transylvania. In all three areas — Transylvania, Lithuania, and Poland — the adorant Unitarians freely referred to the non-adorant radicals among them as "Judaizers."

* *Parts I and II appeared in the March 1978 issue.*

It is regrettable for the study of Protestantism in the Ukraine in the sixteenth and the seventeenth century that the published sources and monographs on religion in "the Grand Duchy" or "Lithuania" deal mostly with ethnic Lithuania or the Duchy as defined by the Union of Lublin in 1569. Protestantism in the Ukrainian lands is only faintly illuminated by such works. Hence, it is primarily other sources and monographs that must provide information about religion on this territory to 1569, and about religion among such families as the Chaplyches to 1577. (Neither the several Chaplych lords nor pastors of their congregations appear, strangely enough, at the synods of the Reformed Church, although until 1565 they would have considered themselves members of the undivided Reformed Church of the Commonwealth.)

The first region which may be considered Ukrainian in our survey was Podlachia (Ukr. Pidliashshia, Pol. Podlasie) which the Grand Duchy ceded to the Polish Crown in 1569 as part of the political congeries collectively called Masovia and distinguished from both Great and Little Poland. In this period the eastern half of Podlachia was linguistically Ukrainian, although today it belongs to Soviet Belorussia. The second region was the palatinates of Ruthenia, Belz, Kholm (Chełm) and Podolia (Ukr. Podillia) which had for some time been under the Polish Crown. The palatinate of Ruthenia was composed of the four districts of Sianik (Sanok), Peremyshl' (Przemyśl), L'viv, and Halych. After the concessions of the Duchy to the east, a third region, comprising the palatinates of Volhynia, Bratslav, and Kiev, was added. The three regions constituted all the Ukrainian territories under Crown Poland until 1618, when the Chernihiv lands were annexed.

A. Calvinism in the Ukrainian Lands

As early as 1559, the unitarianizing Nicholas II Radvila the Black, palatine of Vilnius, proposed that in the interests of uniformity in doctrine, discipline, and ceremonies, the Reformed Church in the Duchy and Poland hold general synods for the whole Commonwealth of "the Two Peoples." The synods' location should be chosen jointly to provide maximum geographical representation in future years. Radvila's wise proposal was not accepted by the Reformed until the decisive and divisive synod held 25 to 30 December 1565, in Węgrów (Uhriv), a town in Podlachia owned by Prince John Kishka (Kyshka). At this synod pedobaptism and believers' baptism were placed on the regular agenda for the first time, and the differences between the factions that were to become the

Major and Minor Reformed churches became so evident that the schism between the Calvinists and Unitarians is usually dated from the event. There had, in fact, been quasi-general synods on "Cyrillic" territory before this catastrophic one: in Zhakiv south of Kholm in June 1563 and in Węgrów itself in December 1563. The strictly Calvinist Major Church held no general Commonwealth-wide synods on Cyrillic territory until the Union of Lublin, partly because the chief exponent of such synods, Nicholas Radvila, died on 29 May 1565, and his heirs turned Catholic. But at the general synod of Sandomierz in 1570 — which met concurrently with the synods of the Czech Brethren and the Lutherans and together with them achieved the Consensus of the three trinitarian Protestant groups of the Commonwealth — the Calvinists, meeting separately, made provision for district (i.e., palatine) superintendents, and hence for district synods, in Ruthenia and Podolia. An important school of the Major Reformed Church later existed in Panivtsi in Podolia.

The Calvinist-Unitarian schism was not the first within the Reformed Church in the Commonwealth. An earlier division was the Stancarist schism (1561–70) of the right wing. Its leader was Francis Stancaro, the Mantuan Hebraist and Reformed controversialist who founded the first church-housed Reformed congregation in the Commonwealth. Stancaro belligerently opposed Osiander, Musculus, Bullinger and, most notably, Calvin, in contending, with Peter Lombard, that Christ was mediator only in his human nature, and he charged them all with Arianism. After his excommunication from the general Reformed Church, Stancaro became pastor in Dubets'ko (Dubiecko) on the Sian (San) in the district of Sianik, where he was surrounded by several Stancarist pastors, the most well known of whom was Christopher of L'viv, a correspondent with Calvin. The Stancarist schism ended with the submission of the Stancarist pastors during the synod that espoused the Federal Union of Sandomierz in 1570. Thereafter, except for attrition toward Unitarianism and for wars during which no distinctions among western confessions were usually made, the history of Calvinism in the Ukrainian lands appears to have been uneventful. Some congregations held together until the partitions of the Commonwealth. In the ethnic Lithuanian and Belorussian parts of the Grand Duchy, especially in the region around Vilnius, Calvinism held on rather well into recent times.

B. Unitarianism in the Ukraine from 1569/77 to 1638

The spread and organization of Unitarianism in the Ukraine falls into three periods. The first (already dealt with in Part II) was characterized by the mingling of Orthodox Judaizers (of at least two kinds), Lutherans (to a small extent), and, especially, the eclectic Reformed (ranging from the Judaizing Orthodox, influenced somewhat by Luther, more by Melanchthon, and most by the Helvetian divines, to proto-Unitarians of disparate tendencies and clarities). The second period encompasses the time from these fluctuating beginnings to the destruction of the Unitarian center in Raków in 1638. The third covers the time from the emergence of Kyselyn in Volhynia as the center of Unitarianism in the whole Commonwealth until the Cossack War and the exile of all Unitarians from the Commonwealth in 1660.

In the obscure first period, many Reformed of proto-Unitarian leanings, both pastors and lords, must surely have attended local synods of the undivided Reformed Church in Latin-rite territory; however, we do not find in attendance, with one or two exceptions, the congregations or persons mentioned in Part II. For the period after the definitive schism, there are records of Unitarianizing local synods being held in Byzantine-rite territory — in Łańcut (Landshut), palatinate of Ruthenia, on 14 June 1567, in Iv"e, palatinate of Vilnius, from 20 to 26 January 1568, and in Losk, palatinate of Vilnius, in 1578. Into the second and third periods a number of recorded local and general synods of the Minor Reformed Church were held in Byzantine-rite territory, some because the Unitarians were heeding the urgent suggestion of Nicholas Radvila, subsidizer of their Bible of 1563 published in Brest (Berestia, Brześć). Thus, as we shall see, the Minor Church in the Ukrainian lands, in the Grand Duchy as truncated in 1569, and in Little Poland continued to maintain the fiction and often the substance of Commonwealth-wide general synods, whereas the more numerous Major Church tended to become more a congeries of regional synods.

For the second and third periods, in particular, it is difficult to distinguish Ukrainian from Polish personalities on the Ukrainian lands, partly because the Ukrainian nobility, like the Lithuanian, appropriated Polish and readily used Latin in conversation, correspondence, and official documents; there was, moreover, much intermarriage between aristocratic Poles and Ukrainians, particularly in Ruthenia and Volhynia. On the history of Unitarianism in the Ukraine there are local Ukrainian and

Polish archival sources, including synodal records, and brief but confused accounts.[49]

There was a relatively high number of Unitarian churches founded on estates in the Ukraine before the destruction of Raków. The Tribunal of Lublin regularly brought, as assessors and litigants, nobles from all the Byzantine-rite palatinates to that partly Protestant town (Lublin did not have a Catholic cathedral until the nineteenth century). Until 1627, Lublin had both a large Calvinist and a large Unitarian congregation and

[49] The Life of Wiszowaty and the Vindication of Stanislas Lubieniecki, both of which contain material bearing on Unitarianism in the Ukraine, are printed as two of seven documents at the end of the invaluable bibliography, *Bibliotheca Antitrinitariorum* (hereafter *BA*), ed. by Benedict Wiszowaty, Jr. (Amsterdam, 1684; facsimile ed. by Lech Szczucki, Warsaw, 1967), with an index of proper names. Both appear as documents in my *Polish Brethren, 1601-1685* (Missoula, Montana, 1978), and will be referred to in that connection. Among the Ukrainians whom Lubieniecki mentions are Andrew Sukhodols'kyi in Pisky (Piaski), kinsmen Peter and Paul, both of Kholm, Prince Janus Zaslavs'kyi, and Prince Ladislas Zbaras'kyi. *BA*, pp. 283–85.

The records of the Reformed Church from 1550 to 1570 have been edited by Maria Sipayłło, *Akta synodów różnowierczych w Polsce*, 2 vols. (Warsaw, 1966–72). A convenient summary of the disparately located and printed allusions to, or records of, the Minor Church is to be found in the well-documented and indispensable article by Stanisław Szczotka, "Synody Arian polskich od założenia Rakowa do wygnania z kraju (1569–1662)," *Reformacja w Polsce* (hereafter *RwP*), 7-8 (1935-36): 21-100. Sipayłło mentions two local Unitarianizing synods before Szczotka's first entry in Raków in 1569; she also provides the fact that the two Major Reformed district synods, of Ruthenia and of Volhynia, were set up at the general synod of Sandomierz in 1570 (*Akta synodów różnowierczych*, 2:271), and the fact that Radvila's proposal for a pan-Commonwealth synod was adopted at Węgrów in 1565 (*Akta synodów różnowierczych*, 2:197). That the idea was proposed earlier is based on the letter of John Utenhove to Calvin, 27 January 1559; *Opera Calvini*, vol. 17, cols. 417f. In this same letter Utenhove reported that Senator John Tarnowski had recently proposed the elimination of bishops from the Upper House of the Diet on the grounds that their primary oath was to the pope rather than to the king. More on this appears in my "The Polish-Lithuanian Calvin," *Festschrift for Ford Lewis Battles*, ed. by Brian Gerrish (Pittsburgh, 1979), ch. 11.

Zenonas Ivinskis, who had a Catholic viewpoint and a mastery of the primary sources and the secondary literature in all languages, including Lithuanian, limits himself almost wholly to ethnic Lithuania, "Die Entwicklung der Reformation in Litauen bis zum Erscheinen der Jesuiten (1569)," *Forschungen zur osteuropäischen Geschichte* 12 (1967): 7–45, with a rich bibliography. Marceli Kosman, *Reformacja i Kontrreformacja w Wielkim Księstwie litewskim* . . . (Wrocław, etc., 1973), and in his bibliographically multilingual "Badania nad Reformacją w Wielkim Księstwie Litewskim (1919–1969)," *Odrodzenia i Reformacja w Polsce* (hereafter *OiRwP*), 16 (1971): 141–64, confines himself largely to ethnic Lithuania and Belorussia. The collectively edited *Monumenta Reformationis Polonicae et Lithuanicae*, in several incomplete series and volumes (Vilnius, 1911, 1913, 1915, 1925), deals mostly with the Church of the Unity (the Czech Brethren) in the areas indicated and with other confessions only in connection with federal union (Vilnius, then Sandomierz, 1570); it has little information relevant to Protestantism in the Ukrainian parts of the Grand Duchy before 1569.

outlying fellowships, and it stood almost on a par with Raków as an intellectual center of Unitarianism. Thus, it was surely the principal point for the dissemination of Unitarianism eastward on the territory partly harrowed by the Muscovite Judaizers (Part I: B). Raków was where many sons of the founders of Unitarian churches in the Ukraine were educated, along with the sons of Catholic, Calvinist, and Unitarian nobles. George Chaplych, founder of the church in Kyselyn in Volhynia, and Stephen Nemyrych, founder of the church in Cherniakhiv in the palatinate of Kiev, sent their sons to study there. As students, Alexander Chaplych and George Nemyrych traveled in the West with Andrew Wiszowaty, grandson of Faustus Socinus, and Peter Sukhodols'kyi in 1631.[50] There were many less notable close contacts between the sons of Ukrainian aristocrats and the intellectual leaders, lay and clerical, of Unitarianism in Little Poland. What attracted the Ukrainians, parents and sons, to Unitarianism was no doubt its simplicity, its openness to the new sciences, its stress on education and printing,[51] and, indeed, its cosmopolitan character — all so markedly different from the confessional and organizational confinement of Lutheranism and, to a lesser extent, of Calvinism. It is possible that the "high" Christology of the Socinians, which beheld the ascended Christ as King of the Cosmos, had some subliminal appeal to once Orthodox aristocrats who would have remembered the *Christos Pantocrator* on the ceilings of Orthodox churches, where icons of the Trinity, by contrast, were uncommon. It is possible, too, that believers' baptism by immersion had a certain appeal to those acquainted with baptismal immersion in Orthodoxy and with the magnificent Epiphanal rite on frozen rivers recalling Christ's baptism in the Jordan. Also, the social gospel of Unitarianism was attractive to some families, notably the Chaplyches, who released their serfs from taxes and socage upon conversion to Unitarianism.[52]

50 *BA*, p. 231; *Polish Brethren*, doc. 1, no. 81. A few hundred Ukrainians studied at foreign universities in the sixteenth century and in the first half of the seventeenth. Domet Oljančyn, "Aus dem Kultur- und Geistesleben der Ukraine," *Kyrios* 3 (1937): 264–78, and 4 (1938): 34–66.

51 Łukasz Kurdybacha stresses this motif in *Z dziejów pedagogiki ariańskiej* (Warsaw, 1958), pp. 157–59. For Protestant presses in the Grand Duchy, as geographically defined by the Union of Lublin, 1569, see Maria Topolska, "Książka na Litwie i Białorusi," *OiRwP* 21 (1976): 145–64; she dates the first Protestant press in Brest to 1553 and in Vilnius to 1574.

52 Wacław Urban, *Chłopi wobec reformacji w Małopolsce w drugiej połowie XVI w.* (Cracow, 1959), p. 59, citing a decree of the Tribunal of Lublin of 18 May 1644. Earl Morse Wilbur, *The History of Unitarianism: Socianism and its Antecedents* (Cam-

In 1581 the Ukrainian nobleman Valentine Nehalevs'kyi, at the urging "of many learned and pious people who love the Word of God and do not understand Polish," translated into Ruthenian and published in Khoroshiv in Volhynia the version of the New Testament (*Novyi Zapovit*) prepared by the Unitarian pastor in Lublin, Martin Czechowic (Cracow, 1577). The introduction, the commentary to the original, and the translation have a Unitarian thrust. A Unitarian church and school were founded at Hoshcha in Volhynia by Gabriel Hois'kyi in about 1600. The school was directed, successively, by Theophilus Młynarz, Daniel Duroski, Solomon Paludius (1616–20), and Albert Caper.[53] The ministers in Hoshcha were all Poles: Christopher Morzkowski (by 1606), Andrew Lubieniecki (until 1609), Samuel Nieciecki (by 1612), and Christopher Stoiński (in 1618).[54] The church itself was probably not dispersed until 1644. It was there that the future False Demetrius (*Lzhedmitrii*) was educated by Matthew Twardochleb and was rebaptized a Unitarian! There was a Unitarian church on the estates of Prince Ostroz'kyi at Ostroh and at Starokostiantyniv before 1608. The churches in Liakhivtsi and Seniutovychi were founded in 1608 by Lord Paul Christopher Seniuta. His son, Peter, became co-pastor of Liakhivtsi with John, the eldest of the three Stoiński brothers. Peter Morzkowski was catechist in the same church in 1619 and was ordained pastor there in 1625. During his ministry at Liakhivtsi, the future compiler of the learned *Politia*

---

bridge, 1945), makes the same claim for the Chaplych family, p. 456, fn. 2; but the references to original sources do not fit. See, however, Orest Levitskii (Levyts'kyi), "Sotsinianstvo v Pol'she i Iugo-Zapadnoi Rossii," *Kievskaia starina* 2 (1882): 217. At the Union of Lublin the Crown and Polish nobles extended labor service (socage: *panshchyna*) to peasants in Crown lands, who thereby became more and more like serfs, increasingly bound to the soil and to service (up to several full days a week). There had been a more highly differentiated aristocracy in the Byzantine-rite portion of the Commonwealth (three classes) than in ethnic Poland (where all members of the *szlachta*, despite great differentiation in actual power based on property, were theoretically equal). Under Polish influence there was in the Ukraine a tendency to conceive of the aristocracy as one fraternity of lords, despite the retention of traditional titles, and a tendency to reduce the two town and village classes (again three groupings) to one. In the intermingling and intermarriage of Poles and Ukrainians and in the spread of Calvinism and Unitarianism in this fluid social situation there is some indication that the Unitarians were more considerate of the lower classes than the Calvinists or the Orthodox lords before their adoption of Protestantism.

53 Caper may have been the son of a German minister at Śmigiel. Cf. Robert Wallace, *Antitrinitarian Biography*, 3 vols. (London, 1850), 3: 10ff. The first minister of the Brethren at Śmigiel, John Krotokowski, had been a Judaizer in the sense, at least, that he had preached only from the Old Testament and refused to adore Christ until forced to do so by the Synod of Raków in 1580.

54 Lubieniecki, *Historia*, p. 277.

ecclesiastica (see p. 199) seems to have conducted himself provocatively, especially between 1624 and 1638, toward the local Catholics, thus enraging the Dominicans. He took occasion at funeral services where non-Unitarian relatives and friends were present to press Unitarianism; he preached expressly against the Dominicans; he ridiculed priests carrying the Host to the sick; he encouraged his students to stone and destroy the local wayside crucifix; and he had called for the martial success of the Lutheran king Gustavus II Adolphus in the Swedish Phase of the Thirty Years' War (1630–35), in the hope he would be elected to succeed King Sigismund III Vasa (1587–1632).[55]

It might be intercalated at this juncture — somewhat out of chronological sequence — that, despite confessional animosities and mutual recriminations, the only Unitarian martyr (in the technical sense of one put to death for his heretical faith by order of church or state) in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was a formerly Orthodox burgher of Bil's'k (Bielsk) in Podlachia named Ivan Tyshkovych.[56] He was executed in 1611 by order of the royal court in Warsaw during the absence (1610–12) of King Sigismund, who was fighting on the eastern front against Muscovy.

The church in Cherniakhiv, with school attached, was founded in the palatinate of Kiev by Stephen Nemyrych, father of the famous George already mentioned, by the year 1610. The rectors of this school appear to have been Germanic in background: Bartholomew Woch, the Prussian John Debel, and the Silesian Paul Myślik. In 1637 a certain Ferberinus and in 1641 Ferdinand Leisentritt were appointed to the rectorship by the synod.[57]

It is at this point that we should connect George Chaplych with his many relations and forebears, some Orthodox, some Unitarian.[58] Earlier (Part I: B) our account dealt with the boisterous freethinker, horseracer, litigant, and protector of "Judaizers," Kadian Chaplych, as well as his

55 Janusz Tazbir, "Jak IMĆ Pan Sieniuta z Dominikanami wojował," *Mówią wieki*, 1971, no. 12, based on manuscripts in the library of the Polish Academy of Sciences at Kórnik.

56 *BA*, pp. 203–206.

57 The list of rectors is from Lubieniecki, *Historia*, p. 277. On Leisentritt see Stanisław Szczotka, "Synody arian polskich," *RwP* 7–8 (1935–36): 70, 83.

58 Most of the ensuing information on the Chaplych families derives from several entries in *Polski słownik biograficzny* (hereafter *PSB*) (Cracow, 1935–), 4: 166a–172b, by Kazimierz Chodynicki, who cites monographs and sources but does not pull together the family history, as I have tried to do here. A major monograph, based on the Chaplych family archives at Shpaniv, since lost, is that of T. J. Stecki, *Z boru i stepu* (Cracow, 1888).

brother Peter. Kadian had four sons, one of whom, Theodore (d. 1611), remained Orthodox. This son became judge of Luts'k, attended the Synod of Brest, and signed a protest against the union of October 1596. He participated in the Protestant-Orthodox Colloquy of Vilnius in May 1599, and was elected one of its "provisors." John, the son of Kadian (or his brother Peter), became prefect of Luts'k (1565–69), castellan of Kiev, and deputy to the palatine tribunal of Kiev in 1597. While still Orthodox, he was chosen a provisor at the Colloquy of Vilnius in 1599, and subsequently became a Unitarian.

Theodore Chaplych, who had remained Orthodox, also had four sons, of whom two — the oldest, Martin, and the youngest, George — became Unitarians. Martin was sent to study at the academy of Nuremberg at Altdorf, where a crypto-Socinian circle of professors and students had long existed. He published his dissertation, *Positiones de principatu* (1597), there and then went on to the University of Basel, matriculating as a "Polonus," and published a new thesis, *De virtute morali* (1579). After the death of their Orthodox father, in 1612, George built a walled church and established a college in Kyselyn, while Martin founded a church and school at Beres'k (Berestko, Beresk). George and Martin attended the Synod of Raków in 1612, and signed a letter urging the Calvinist and Unitarian congregations in Lublin to federate in mutual defense. In 1616, at the dietine of Luts'k, deputy Martin, though now a Unitarian, defended the Orthodox. In 1618 and again in 1623, George Chaplych took part in the synod at Raków. In 1623 he and his brother Martin gave two hundred florins for the purchase of publishing materials to propagate the Unitarian faith. Both Chaplyches were deputies at the Convocation Diet of 1632 that led to the election of Ladislas IV Vasa (1632–48), where they protested against the restrictions placed on Unitarians. Martin Chaplych's seat was Beres'k, where he died between 1633 and 1638. His estate passed to his sons, Andrew and Alexander.[59]

C. Unitarianism in the Ukraine, 1638 to 1648: The "Golden Age"

George Chaplych outlived his younger brother Martin into Unitarianism's crisis year in the Commonwealth, that is, 1638. In that year the Diet of Warsaw approved the destruction of Raków and, by strong implica-

[59] *BA*, p. 236; *Polish Brethren*, doc. 1, no. 90.1. It was Martin's son Alexander who traveled with Andrew Wiszowaty, George Nemyrych, and Peter Sukhodols'kyi in 1631; see above, fn. 50.

tion, made the restraint of Unitarianism a matter of policy in the Commonwealth. Thereafter some students, professors, and printers from Raków took refuge in Kyselyn. Under the patronage of George Chaplych and other Ukrainian noblemen, its school became the intellectual center of Unitarianism in the Commonwealth for nearly a decade.

The first act of the afflicted Unitarians was to prepare a joint parliamentary protest. At least some Orthodox as well as Calvinists and Czech Brethren among the senators and deputies joined the Unitarians. Thus, the Confederation of Vilnius of 1599 was expanded, and now included the following Unitarians: George Nemrych of Cherniakhiv, deputy of Kiev; Alexander Chaplych of Halychany, deputy of Volhynia; Andrew Chaplych-Shpanovs'kyi; George Chaplych; Prince George Chetvertyns'kyi, deputy of Volhynia; Gabriel Hulevych of Voityn, deputy of Volhynia; Tobias Ivanyts'kyi of Ivanychi; and Stephen Liniewski, judge of the castle at Volodymyr.[60]

The Unitarians' second step was undertaken alone, after the fateful diet, at the Synod of Kyselyn in May 1638. Deputy George Nemyrych of Cherniakhiv appealed to the Calvinist grand duke Christopher II Radvila in a letter of 28 October 1638, urging him to head the common defense of the religious rights of all dissidents within the Commonwealth. Other signatories were Lords Alexander, Andrew, and George Chaplych-Shpanovs'kyi and Tobias Ivanyts'kyi, and Pastors Christopher Lubieniecki, Christopher Stoiński and Jonas Szlichtyng.[61] While awaiting a response during that year, Nemyrych founded churches at Shershni and Ushomyr in the palatinate of Kiev and improved his school at Cherniakhiv.

George Nemyrych was a remarkable and unusual Ukrainian leader. His Orthodox grandfather, Andrew, lord of Cherniakhiv and judge of Kiev, was converted to Unitarianism by his wife, a member of the Khreptov family.[62] Their son, Stephen, studied at Altdorf and Basel (as did Martin Chaplych), returned to marry the Unitarian Martha Voina-

[60] These and many more names are given in a seventeenth-century note to Lubieniecki's Vindication, *BA*, p. 278. Cf. ibid., p. 283, fn., in reference to the times of Henry of Valois and Stephen Batory, where it says that two Ukrainians, openly not Unitarian, supported the inclusion of Unitarians in the *pax dissidentium*: Prince Basil Constantine Ostroz'kyi and Roman Hois'kyi of Hoshcha, castellan of Kiev and captain of Volodymyr.

[61] The letter is published with a preface in *Polish Brethren*, doc. 21. For more on the letter and the synod of May see V. Lypyns'kyi, "Arians'kyi soimyk v Kyselyni na Volyni v maiu 1638," *Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva im. Shevchenka* 96 (1910): 41–57.

[62] Lubieniecki, *Historia*, p. 277.

rovs'ka, and became chamberlain of Kiev and captain of Ovruch. The oldest son of Stephen and Martha Nemyrych, George was born in Volhynia about 1612. After receiving an education like his father's, he enrolled at the newly prestigious academy at Raków before going on his academic tour of 1631–1632. After returning to his estate, he recruited, at his own expense, German mercenaries for the Polish-Muscovite war (1632–34), but was ordered by King Ladislas IV (1632–48) to fight under Crown Grand Hetman Stanislas Koniecpolski along the Moldavian border. Under Koniecpolski he also fought against Gustavus II Adolphus in Pomerania.

After his return from the wars, George married the Unitarian Elizabeth Słupecka, daughter of the castellan of Lublin. Through his mother-in-law he became related to several members of the Leszczyński family. In 1637, just before the fateful Decree of Warsaw of 1638, Nemyrych, as deputy-assessor-elect at the Crown Tribunal in Lublin, had valiantly arranged for a debate between the Polish Brethren, who had been driven out of town in 1627, and the Jesuits. In 1640, Deputy Nemyrych doggedly submitted at the Diet of Warsaw a renewed protest against the parliamentary decree against Raków, but failed to rally sufficient Calvinist support.

Before continuing the extraordinary account of Nemyrych, let us pick up the other threads of Ukrainian Unitarian history. George Chaplych, with much help from other nobles, transformed his school at Kyselyn into a new Raków during the decade after 1638. The rectors of Kyselyn, after expanding from the relocation of several members of the dissolved Raków community, were, in succession:[63] Eustace Kysil' (Gizelius; rector in 1634–38), who continued to teach and write even after being synodally excommunicated for the extreme views in his writings (not specified);[64] Peter Stegmann (Tribander; 1638–40);[65] Theodore Simon of Lüneburg in Holstein (Philip Cosmius; 1640); and Louis Hohleisen (1640–44). Two rectors had written important works before being called to Kyselyn. Kysil'

63 Lubieniecki, *Historia*, p. 277.

64 On Kysil' see *BA*, pp. 138, 143; *PSB*, 8 (1959–60): 19.

65 The elder Joachim Stegmann was minister in Mark Brandenburg and became rector of Raków (1626–30). He had two sons, Joachim, Jr. and Christopher; Wallace, *Antitrinitarian Biography*, 3: 60, 66ff. He also had three brothers — Christopher, Lawrence, and Peter. Lawrence was the last rector of Raków (1634–38). Stanisław Tync mistakenly, I think, calls Lawrence a brother of the antecedent rector Stegmann, "Zarys dziejów wyższej szkoły Braci Polskich w Rakowie 1602–1638," Stanisław Cynarski, ed., *Raków, ognisko arianizmu* (Cracow, 1968), p. 148. In any case, both Lawrence and Peter Stegmann of Kyselyn disguised themselves by transposing their surnames into Greek.

had published a Greek translation of *De imitatione Christi* (Frankfurt-on-the-Oder, 1626) and a Polish *Antyapologia* (Cracow, 1631). The latter was dedicated to Archimandrite Peter Mohyla of Kiev and was directed against the *Apologia peregrynacjej do krajów wschodnich* (Ľviv, 1628) written by the theological, philological, and literary personage and now archbishop, Meletius Smotryts'kyi of Polotsk (Polatsk).[66] Smotryts'kyi (ca. 1578–1633), son of the first rector of Prince Ostroz'kyi's college at Ostroh, had studied under the Jesuits in Vilnius without becoming Catholic, visited German university towns and absorbed the Protestant spirit, and returned to Ostroh in 1607 to teach Latin and Greek. In 1609 he removed to Vilnius, there identifying himself with the school of the Orthodox brotherhood and opposing the Union of Brest. The point of Kysil's *Antyapologia* was to disclose to Mohyla and his academy the degree to which Smotryts'kyi, as the defender of Orthodoxy, was propagating "Protestant" ideas of the very kind that Unitarians also opposed (predestination, etc.). The other literary rector of Kyselyn was Cosmius, who before coming to his post had published an anti-papal, Lutheran *Retractatio* (1630). Cosmius was rector for only a year, but remained active in the college thereafter.

As early as 1640, the Catholic prelates Bishop Andrew Bembecki of Luts'k and Dean Stanislas Urbanowicz of Volodymyr contended that Lord George Chaplych, patron of Kyselyn, was in effect going against the royal decree of 1638 by reviving Raków in his town. Eventually, by litigation in the palatinate court and, later, in the Crown Tribunal of Lublin, the two prelates succeeded in having the school ordered closed by 1644, although George Chaplych defiantly kept it open until his death about four years later.

In 1643, the theological leader of Unitarianism, Andrew Wiszowaty, was assigned as colleague to John Stoiński in Shershni, then under the patronage of Stephen Voinarovs'kyi, master of the royal hunt in the palatinate of Kiev. Wiszowaty swiftly became a de facto superintendent of the Unitarian churches in all the eastern palatinates under the Crown. At the behest of Nemyrych, he even crossed the Dnieper to carry out his mission in Orel;[67] at the time, Nemyrych compared him to St. Andrew, the legendary apostle to the proto-Slavs and patron of Byzantium. In 1644 Wiszo-

[66] On Smotryts'kyi see Mykhailo Vozniak, *Istoriia ukrains'koi literatury* (Ľviv, 1921), p. 61 and passim; cf. also L. Ie. Makhnovets', *Ukrains'ki pys'mennyky* (Kiev, 1960), pp. 547–54.

[67] *BA*, p. 236; *Polish Brethren*, doc. 1, no. 90.

Some information on the institutional aspect of Unitarianism in the Ukraine is provided in a register written by Deacon Peter Lubieniecki and by John Giejżanowski for the yoked churches of Kyselyn and Beres'k from 1632. It shows that the pastor annually received between two and three hundred florins with gifts and perquisites, and that there was much eleemosynary activity.[81]

Two annual synods took place in a certain Rashkiv (Raszków), quite probably at a town by that name on the left bank of the Dniester River below Iampil', a relatively safe site just across the river from the Ottoman protectorate of Moldavia.[82] In 1649, the synod again made an appointment to a church in ethnic Lithuania, assigning Gratian Kurosz (or Kurowski) to Kedainiai (Kiejdany) (1649–53).[83] Kurosz had presented the synod with a compendium on congregational discipline, "De emendatione coetuum," but its publication was not approved. George Durosz was named minister of the yoked churches of Ivanychi and Halychany. In 1650 pastoral appointments were made for Gdańsk and Lusławice, and for as far east as Kiev. The reprinting of Krell's *De uno Deo Patre* brought about the censure of Daniel Zwicker for defending Krell without submitting his arguments to the synod.

The annual synod met twice in Czarków.[84] In 1651 there was further discussion by those present of a small catechism written in either Latin or Polish. The synod also fussed over several references to translations from or into German, but, strangely, said very little about Ruthenian; at most, Greek was mentioned. In 1652 Wiszowaty presented for assessment his

---

rich purity and eternity in mutual fidelity. The service also included spiritual songs and a nuptial homily based on Scripture.

Burial, too, was generally very simple in the Reformed Church throughout Europe, often without the pastor present unless as mourner. The practice of the Polish Brethren may have been simplified even more, due to their belief in the death of the soul with the body pending resurrection. They often buried their deceased on estates rather than in consecrated cemeteries and often used no markers — a simplicity which offended their Catholic and Orthodox neighbors; however, their pastors were recorded to have delivered eulogies in many cases. The evidence on burial is scanty and may well have varied according to region, period, and class.

[81] Janusz Tazbir, "Kisielińsko-bereski zbór Braci Polskich," *Przegląd Historyczny* 57 (1966): 126–36.

[82] Szczotka, "Synody," pp. 90ff. The Synod of Żulina appointed one minister, a certain Ladenbach, for the same Lithuanian town at the request of its owner, Wojciech Arciszewski: ibid., p. 86. There are several ethnically Polish towns by the name of Raszków, but none in a likely location; it is almost certain that the reference is to the site, south of Yampil', which is now submerged by a Soviet dam at Dubossary.

[83] Kosman, *Reformacja i kontrreformacja*, p. 241.

[84] Szczotka, "Synody," pp. 91–93.

Annotationes in universum Novum Testamentum to a synodal committee of two, while Daniel Zwicker presented his *Mysterium Trinitatis*, in both Latin and German versions, to a committee of three. Peter Morzkowski presented his revised *Politia ecclesiastica* for similar assessment. The synod requested Szlichtyng to prepare for publication "de ratione instaurandae cum Evangelicis [Calvinists] unionis," which, it seems, never came out. Interest was shown again in Kedainiai and for the first time in Taurage, both places in ethnic Lithuania where a certain Hesichów (Hesychius) was a worthy but needy pastor.[85] A number of pastoral assignments were enacted.

In 1653 the annual synod was back on mixed Latin- and Byzantine-rite terrain, in Siedliska. Its most notable act was to send another three hundred florins to John Krell, Jr., who, having spent three years studying in England, was requested to return home. At the Synod of Czarków in 1654, Morzkowski's *Politia ecclesiastica* was again approved after thorough scrutinizing by a committee of two. These annual synods represented the entire Unitarian community in the Commonwealth.

It was the synod held in 1655 at Rashkiv, where the brothers Christopher and John Krell, Jr., had served as pastors, that made the important decision to publish a psalter in both Polish and Ruthenian and to translate Szlichtyng's Confession into Ruthenian.[86] Nicholas Cichowski, S.J., whose attacks had already been fielded by several synods, said in his *Manes Slichtingiani seu Trutina Vindiciarum Confessionis Socininae Varsoviae exustae editarum* (Cracow, 1659), that the Confession "was rampaging to the great peril of Christian souls throughout Volhynia and [the Kiev palatinate of] the Ukraine."[87] Cichowski himself did not know of any version of the work other than that burned in Warsaw by the public hangman. This synod at Rashkiv, which met during the first year of the Swedish War (1655–60), reflected the political and military strains of the time.

The uprising led by Hetman Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi that began in

[85] Szczotka, "Synody," p. 95; Wallace, *Antitrinitarian Biography*, 3: 27.

[86] The inaccessible Jesuit work is noted by Adam Jocher, *Obraz . . . literatury i nauk w Polsce*, 2 vols. (Vilnius, 1840, 1842), 2: 535. The Confession does not appear in Fedir Maksymenko, *Kyrylychni starodruky ukrains'kykh drukaren', shcho zberihaiut'sia u l'vivs'kykh zbirkakh (1574–1800)* (L'viv, 1975). Levitskii, "Sotsinianism," p. 497, intimates that the Confession might well have appeared in Ruthenian. My sources, besides Jocher, are *BA*, p. 143, and Szczotka, "Synody," p. 95.

[87] Jocher, *Obraz . . . literatury i nauk*, 2: 535, excerpts page 8 of Cichowski's works, where the Jesuit made this claim even before a Ruthenian version of the Confession could have been available.

1648 — the year of the election of John Casimir Vasa (1648–68) — was a religio-ethnic and social war of Orthodox Cossacks and Ukrainian peasants against the ruling classes, many of whom were Poles or Polonized Ukrainians. Religiously it was directed against Catholics, especially the "traitorous" Uniates, Protestants (perhaps particularly the Unitarians) and Jews. The uprising was extended by the agreement of the Cossack Council at Pereiaslav in 1654 to collaborate with the Muscovite tsar in common with the Swedes against the Commonwealth. The Ukrainians considered the agreement of Pereiaslav an alliance and the acknowledgment of remote suzerainty; the Russians viewed it as a submission of the Cossacks and Ukrainians to Muscovite sovereignty.

During the joint Cossack and Muscovite inroads into the Commonwealth, reaching to Vilnius and Lublin, the Polish families settled in the Ukraine and the Polonized, i.e., Catholicized or Protestantized, Ukrainian aristocracy and gentry looked to the Swedish invaders for help. Their situation was dire, and even many Orthodox landowners suffered at the hands of the Cossacks.

Among the Unitarians, George Nemyrych was discharging a series of leadership roles. Since defending the Unitarians at the Diet of 1640, he had been in personal difficulty, despite being the second greatest landowner in the palatinate of Kiev and its vice chamberlain. Although his position was confirmed in 1641 by royal charter, Nemyrych was harassed for his religion by the palatine of Kiev, Janus Tyshkevych, and ordered to close all the Unitarian churches on his vast estates. In the meantime, he had joined the Calvinist grand duke Janus XI Radvila (1640–55) to secure the election of Sigismund, younger son of George I Rákóczy of Transylvania, in return for general religious toleration; but Ladislas's half-brother, papally dispensed former Jesuit Cardinal John Casimir Vasa, was elected instead, in 1648.

After the swift success of the Swedish king Charles X Gustavus, claimant to the Polish throne, Nemyrych surrendered to the king's representative, General Robert Douglas. Nemyrych went on to conquer Cracow, at the time the haven of many Unitarian refugees. In the Jewish suburb of Kazimierz he and Alexander Chaplych joined Stanislas Lubieniecki in a parley with Charles, seeking a new basis for religious toleration in the Commonwealth under the Lutheran conqueror.[88] His

[88] The diary of the historian Stanislas Lubieniecki has been partially published by Janusz Tazbir, "Diariusz Stanisława Lubienieckiego," *OiRwP* 5 (1960): 201–221, especially 221.

boldest move was, at length, to renounce Unitarianism. In his now lost *Skrypt*, Nemyrych called for all Protestants to join the Orthodox as truly apostolic. The *Skrypt* was refuted, in Polish and Latin, by Samuel Przypkowski's spirited *Responsio*.[89]

Nemyrych proposed to the new Cossack hetman, Ivan Vyhovs'kyi, a plan for the reunification of the Ukraine with the Commonwealth as "the Grand Duchy of the Ukraine" (the address, in Polish, also referred to the *naród ruski*). With Crown Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, the Grand Duchy would be a component of a constitutionally reconceived Commonwealth, in which Nemyrych would be chancellor. Under the plan, only Orthodoxy and Roman-rite Catholicism would be licit religions, so the Uniates would be obliged to choose one or the other rite and jurisdiction. The plan was agreed to at Hadiach in 1658 by the Crown's plenipotentiaries. Although also called the Duchy of Ruthenia, the new entity included only the palatinates of Bratslav and Kiev and the palatinate of Chernihiv above Kiev on the left bank of the Dnieper. Nemyrych tried, unsuccessfully, to defend and enlarge his plan in a speech at the Diet in 1659.[90] Shortly afterwards, while heading a Cossack unit, he was slain by his own people, who suspected him of being too Polonized.

During this period of cruel warfare against Protestants and Catholics, including Uniates, the Unitarian synods resumed their meetings. In 1658, the same year as the parliamentary decree of banishment of Unitarians as "Arians or Anabaptists" within three years on pain of death or conversion to a licit religion,[91] the annual synod convened in two discrete meetings, one at Czarków, of which nothing is known, and the other at Dazhva, which almost fatuously charged John Arciszewski with having published two of John Krell's works, *Commentarium in epistolam ad Romanos* and *Tractatus de Spiritu Sancto*, the latter having been discussed and approved at earlier synods.[92] On 22 March 1659, the Diet shortened the period of grace to two years, requiring all Unitarians out of the Commonwealth by 10 July 1660. Now, should they conform, it could only be to Catholicism. The synod held in Czarków in 1659 dealt with the Unitarians' plight as best it could.

[89] The *Skrypt* can be reconstructed only from the refutatory *Responsio, Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum*, vol. 9 (Amsterdam, 1692).
[90] An English translation is given in *Polish Brethren*, doc. 28. The Polish text is in J. Daneykowicz Ostrowski, *Swada polska i łacińska* (Lublin, 1745), pp. 140–42.
[91] At first Unitarians were permitted to join any licit Church; from 1660 they would be required to convert to the Roman Catholic Church.
[92] Szczotka, "Synody," p. 96.

Although some Unitarian lords in the Ukraine had treated their peasants well and several had freed their serfs upon conversion to Unitarianism, they were as much the object of the wrath of the Orthodox peasants and Cossacks as all other nobles. For one thing, most Unitarian landlords and their bailiffs were indistinguishable from their Orthodox, Catholic, or Protestant contemporaries, despite their faith's strong exhortations to social righteousness. However, Unitarian congregations did survive in Babin (Bobin, near Koszyce), Cherniakhiv, Dazhva, and Kyselyn even as late as 1658. And when Alexander Chaplych-Shpanovs'kyi, for instance, had to leave his last estate at Zboroshchovo in 1660, among his peasants, whom he had long before freed, "there was not weeping but wailing," reported a Calvinist lord observing the scene, himself moved to tears by the sad spectacle.[93]

The very last synod or assembly of the Minor Church took place in 1662, perhaps under the protection of Prince Boguslas Radvila (1620–69), governor general (1657–69) of Ducal East Prussia for the Great Elector of Brandenburg, Frederick William. It would appear that this synod met in Podlachia (before 1569 a palatinate of the Grand Duchy) at Zabłudów in Byzantine-rite territory ten miles south of the famous Orthodox monastery of Supraśl. It is possible that the spirited *Vindiciae pro Unitariorum religionis libertate,* known to have been composed by Stanislas Lubieniecki, was delivered there by Samuel Przypkowski before Orthodox, Catholic, and Calvinist lords.[94]

After the Treaty of Oliwa and the implementation of the decree of banishment, both in 1660, no Lutheranism and scarcely any Calvinism remained in the Ukraine, in contrast to their continued existence in Belorussia. The Unitarians escaped to Transylvania, East Prussia (lost as fief of the Crown by the Treaty of Oliwa), Silesia, other parts of Germany, and, notably, to the Netherlands.

D. Ukrainian Unitarianism

The register of the Kyselyn and Beres'k congregations and a manuscript copy of Morzkowski's *Politia ecclesiastica* were among documents

[93] Tazbir, "Na ziemiach ukraińskich," p. 117.

[94] That there was such a synod somewhere in the Commonwealth is stated by Szczotka, "Synody," p. 97, with sources adduced. The *Vindiciae,* preserved in *BA,* pp. 265–96, and translated as doc. 29 of my *Polish Brethren,* is clearly the work of Lubieniecki. But it may well have been delivered by Przypkowski, as suggested by Bock, *Socinianismus,* 1: 699. Cf. Chmaj, *Przypkowski,* pp. 71 ff.

carried to Cluj.[95] Most of what is known about Unitarians in the Commonwealth was published by exiles, especially in East Prussia and the Netherlands, among whom were Jonas Szlichtyng and Andrew Wiszowaty. The result has been a tendency to interpret the Commonwealth's Unitarianism in light of what came to be the most assimilable aspects of Socinianism there, namely, as a forerunner of Deism. However, it was not that, either in ethnic Poland or in Polonized and Ruthenian Ukraine. Unitarianism regarded itself as the Minor Reformed Evangelical Church — unitarian, immersionist, and presbyterian — in which the annual mixed synod of laymen and clergy had enormous control over preaching, teaching, writing, printing, and mutual disciplining.

Once its center in the Commonwealth shifted from Little Poland to Volhynia — more particularly, from Raków to Kyselyn — did Unitarianism acquire any Ukrainian features? I believe that Unitarianism did, indeed, absorb some faint but distinctive Ukrainian traits, due to the many works commissioned, printed, reprinted, and translated into Ruthenian or Greek, and the related actions of the synods.

The Unitarians' strong yearning for the recovery of apostolic Christianity made them feel some kinship with the Orthodox, especially in Byzantine-rite territory. For unlike the Roman Catholics in ethnic Poland, the Orthodox observed communion in both kinds for the laity, approved married priests, organized themselves in brotherhoods, upheld near autocephaly with regard to the metropolitan and patriarch, and controlled their bishops through lordly members and brotherhoods. The two religious groups had a common enemy in Roman Catholicism and its eastward extension, the Uniate Church. The several translations of Unitarian and other works, like *Imitatio Christi,* into Greek, suggest that the Unitarians really hoped to win over not only the Orthodox aristocracy, but also the few theological intellectuals rallying around the archimandrite and metropolitan, Peter Mohyla. The amount of Unitarian liturgical, devotional, canonical, and theological material translated into Ruthenian was not great, but one must keep in mind that the primary diplomatic, commercial, and literary languages of the Commonwealth were Latin and Polish: even major Orthodox apologies were written in Polish, and the language of Mohyla's academy in Kiev was Latin.

The second trait of Unitarianism in its Golden Age under Ukrainian

[95] Hungary was largely reunited after its tripartition in 1699 by the Treaty of Karlovac (Karlowitz), when the Commonwealth regained southeastern Ukrainian lands lost at Buchach (Buczacz) in 1672.

protection was theological conservatism. Three of Socinus's distinctive points were abjured, muted, or altered. Even the Catechism of Raków of 1605, though it came to be printed in four languages besides the original Polish, was never translated into Ruthenian; although not the work of Socinus, it was directly inspired by his Racovian colloquies. Yet the Catechism was in effect replaced by Szlichtyng's Confession, a scriptually annotated Apostles' Creed, which upon publication in Latin in 1642 became the official standard of Unitarianism in the Commonwealth. This Confession, over against the Racovian Catechism of 1605/08/09, espoused believers' immersion and called the Lord's Supper the solemn Eucharist (of *Politica ecclesiastica*). It modified Socinus's eschatology to accommodate a general resurrection and last judgment of the wicked as well as the righteous. The Confession also moved somewhat closer to the Arminian view of the Atonement without wholly obscuring some of Socinus's essential asseverations. Szlichtyng went beyond Socinus in exalting the ascended Christ as a veritable *Christos Pantocrator,* although still wholly human. Perhaps the Greek patristic concept of the Second Adam as *Christus victor et regnans* influenced Szlichtyng in an Orthodox environment. His Confession, authorized by the Synod of Kyselyn in 1639, was then chosen to be taken to Toruń for the abortive Colloquium Charativum (1644/45) as more representative of their scripturally Protestant and "high" Unitarianism and as more acceptable to other Protestants and perhaps to Catholics than the Racovian Catechism. This Confession is, in any case, one of the few major documents known to have been authorized for translation and publication in Ruthenian (1655). In light of the information given above (Parts I: A and I: B) it is of note that the Unitarians after 1638 centered synodally in the Ukraine were never obliged to defend themselves against charges of either "Judaizing" or "freethinking."

Another characteristic of Unitarianism in the Ukraine (also in the Grand Duchy) was the virtual abandonment of other-cheek pacifism. In the Ukrainian milieu the feeling spread that the pacifism of early Raków, akin to that of the Hutterites and the Mennonites, and of Socinus himself in casuistically camouflaged forms, should be abandoned in the parlous times and hazardous regions in which the majority of Unitarians now found themselves. The Polish lord Samuel Przypkowski and the Volhynian noble George Nemyrych had no qualms about fighting directly against Moscow or the Cossacks or, in the case of Nemyrych, indirectly against the Commonwealth. The principal Unitarian theologians, like Szlichtyng and Wiszowaty, moved cautiously toward approving defen-

sive wars. Administratively, Volhynia and the palatinates to the east had belonged to the Grand Duchy before their separation by the provisions of the Union of Lublin. It seems that the Unitarians of Volhynia and of the eastern palatinates continued to feel themselves part of the Grand Duchy. In the synods after 1638 more than before, Unitarianism was regarded as a unit, running not only east to west, from ethnic to Crown Poland, but also north to south. Many decisions reached by general synods in the Ukraine dealt with pastoral appointments, subventions, etc., for churches in the Grand Duchy. Because "Lithuanian" Unitarianism was under the abiding influence of Budny and was "realistic" on the issues of office-holding and defensive war, a pan-Commonwealth outreach was easier for Unitarian synods convening on territory that formerly belonged to the Grand Duchy.[96] Since the Czech Brethren and even the Calvinists had not been notably strong in the Ukraine, Protestantism can be said virtually to have ended in the Ukraine by 1660. Afterwards, only Roman-rite and Uniate Catholicism and Orthodoxy lived, however uneasily, side by side on Ukrainian lands. In the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, by contrast, Calvinist and Lutheran churches survived even the dissolution of the Commonwealth.

The charges of Judaizing among certain Ukrainian nobles that had emanated from the Pseudo-Kurbskii circle in Belorussia (Part I: B) were not repeated during the decade 1638–1648, when Volhynia was the principal center of Unitarianism in the Commonwealth. Indeed, some Volhynian families that had earlier been pilloried as Judaizing came to espouse Unitarianism, which might be what their religious enemies had originally feared. Yet neither in the Reformed nor in the Orthodox context did the later Unitarians need to defend themselves against such charges in synod or elsewhere. It is likely that the Catholics and Orthodox, who were often related by intermarriage and had a common, largely Byzantine-rite environment, made little distinction between the Calvinist

[96] Hiador Sztripszky (Stryps'kyi), "Ukránia és az unitarizmus," *Keresztény Magvető* 50 (1915): 89–99, 150–62, likewise points out that after 1638, when Unitarianism came to center synodally in palatinates once under the Grand Duchy, it tended to be more concerned with the Unitarian church to the north than when most of the synods had been held in Little Poland, 1565–1638. While Unitarianism centered in the Ukraine continued to adore Christ (against Budny), it did take over without debate Budny's positive view of magistracy and defensive war (against Socinus). It fully recovered believers' baptism by immersion (against Socinus) to the extent that the Minor Church had ever really heeded its own Catechism of Raków of 1605. The Catechism still showed the influence of Socinus (d. 1604) who had opposed baptism of any kind (except for converts from Islam and Judaism, largely hypothetical).

and the Unitarian Reformed. The Unitarian Brethren in the Ukraine, in synod with those still living in ethnic Poland, tempered the charges against the Budnyites in Belorussia, who were, in fact, Judaizers in one of the five senses given at the outset of our discussion (Introduction).

It is unlikely that in the seventeenth century Unitarians in the Ukraine were called Judaizers by the Orthodox and the Uniates as their predecessors had once been. The Orthodox may have become more tolerant because the Unitarians had become somewhat less radical on Ukrainian soil and were known to favor the Orthodox in the great Catholic versus Orthodox controversy that developed after 1596.

IV. PROTESTANTISM IN OTHER UKRAINIAN LANDS

A few words should be said about two Ukrainian regions which were never part of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth but once belonged to Hungarian or Hapsburg domains: (1) Carpatho-Ukraine, which was the third Slavic constituent of Czechoslovakia from 1918 to 1945; and (2) Upper Bukovyna, which was attached to Austria-Hungary from 1775 to 1918 and then became part of Rumania until 1945.

We know very little about Protestants of any kind in these two areas during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The sources make little distinction among the various Protestant confessions. In any case, they seem to have been written by Germanic colonists who seldom communicated their views to the surrounding Slavs. We can only surmise that in the late sixteenth century a few Hutterite colonies hived off from Moravia into the Byzantine-rite portions of Hungary and Transylvania now part of the Ukraine's Transcarpathian oblast' or into the eastern palatinates of the Commonwealth. We do know that one major Moravian communitarian Anabaptist Hutterite leader, Ulrich Stadler, established a Hutterite colony ca. 1536 in Krasnets', near Volodymyr; his several letters from there are signed "Ladomir aus Podolien."[97]

It has been proposed that in the Carpatho-Ukraine during the late sixteenth and the seventeenth century a majority of the local population under Calvinist and possibly Unitarian lords were for a time Protestant.[98]

[97] Lydia Miller, ed., *Glaubenszeugnisse oberdeutscher Taufgesinnten* (Leipzig, 1938), pp. 232, 235; Ewa Maleczyńska, "Ulrik von Stadler," *Przegląd Historyczny* 60 (1959): 473–85.

[98] Vasyl' Hadžega, "Vplyv reformatsii na podkarpatskykh rusynov," with a Hungarian summary, "A reformáció hatása a kárpataljai ruszinokra," *Zoria/Hajnal* 3 (1943): pp. 5–50. See also Aleksei L. Petrov, "Otzvuk reformatsii v russkom Zakar-

This seems scarcely to comport, however, with the rivalry between Hapsburg Upper Hungary and Transylvania in this area before the reunification of Hungary in 1699, when it would have been in the interests of the Hapsburgs and the Transylvanians to compromise by making Uniates of the Ukrainian population in the contested territory. The Czech Brethren entered eastern Slovakia and some Hutterites were invited there not only to colonize, but also to preach to the Slovakians, notably the former priest Leonard Lochmaier in Szpolna (Spolná) and Oroszlánkő (Ruská Luka).[99] There seems to have been no Czech Brethren or Hutterites in Subcarpathia. No reliable information about Protestants in Bukovyna is available for this period.

The Mennonites, who had established themselves at the mouth of the Vistula by 1535 and later throughout Royal and Ducal Prussia, had their leader, Menno Simons, among them almost as long as did their coreligionists in the Netherlands. In the sixteenth and the seventeenth century the Unitarians sought fraternal relations with the Mennonites, but every overture was turned back. The Mennonites rapidly expanded upstream and founded a settlement near Warsaw, possibly during the last years of the Commonwealth. They settled in Volhynia in large numbers, mostly after the partitions. The whole of modern Ukraine was a major attraction to Mennonite settlers primarily after 1789, although the communitarian Anabaptists had at least one Bruderhof in Vyshen'ka, up the Desna River from Kiev, by 1770.

During the eighteenth century Protestant migration into the Ukraine became much more extensive. It did not, however, significantly affect the indigenous Ukrainian populations, as had the presence of the Czech Brethren, the Lutherans, and particularly the Major and Minor Re-

---

pat'e XVI v.," in *Materialy dlia istorii ugorskoi Rusi*, vol. 8 (Prague, 1923), which deals with the Niahiv sermons on the gospels. See text, p. 190.

[99] The Hutterites, who were later called, in Hungarian, *Habans*, the Italian Unitarians, and the Czech Brethren in Moravia and Slovakia, especially as represented by their porcelain and other crafts, are dealt with by Maria Horvath-Krisztinkovicha in "Wiedertäufer und Arianer im Karpatenraum," *Ungarn-Jahrbuch* 3 (1971): 46–68. She deals with a later period and another region in "Die verschollene Keramik der Bartmennoniten in Russland (Ukraine)," *Keramos*, 1972. Her father, Bela Krisztinkovich, deals with Anabaptists and unitarian Sabbatarian (Judaizing) Anabaptists — e.g., Andrew Fischer, whom Queen Isabelle the Jagiellon's chancellor Jerome Łaski (older brother of John Łaski) tolerated at his residence in Kežmarok in Slovakia — in "Glimpses into the Early History of Anabaptism in Hungary," *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 43 (1969): 127–41; but again there is no clear lead into Ukrainian Carpathia.

formed Churches in the period from the mid-sixteenth through the seventeenth century.

Harvard University

THE IDENTITY OF GOGOL'S *VIJ**

DANIEL RANCOUR-LAFERRIERE

Gogol''s Ukrainian tale *Vij* has elicited a considerable amount of critical attention For the most part this attention has been concentrated on the thematic parallels between the tale and other works in Russian and non-Russian literature. The research of Bolte and Polivka on the Grimm brothers' *Die Prinzessin im Sarge und die Schildwache,* for example, notes the similarity between Gogol''s tale and various tales from many folk traditions, including the German, Polish, Ukrainian, Belorussian, Russian, Norwegian, Icelandic, French, Magyar, Italian, Armenian, and Gypsy (Bolte & Polivka, 1913–1932, III, 531–537). The most detailed comparative studies are by the Soviet semiotician Vjačeslav Ivanov (1971; 1973). Ivanov's discussions roam through Celtic mythology, Hittite rituals, the Old Scandinavian *Edda,* the Argus myth, ancient Chinese myths, and tales of various North American Indian tribes. Particularly interesting is Abaev's suggestion (1958) that the name "Vij" may be etymologically related to the names of the Iranian god *Vayu* and the Ossetian hero *Wæjug,* although Ivanov is not totally convinced by Abaev on this matter. Ivanov's own suggestion is that Gogol''s word "Vij," whether real or invented, must be etymologically connected with the root of the Russian verb "vit'"/Ukrainian "vyty" (1973, 165; cf. below, 218).

Much of the thematic content in *Vij* is not only parallel to but actually borrowed from elsewhere. The sources include: Grimm's fairy tales (see Petrov's commentary in Gogol''s *PSS,* II; Maguire, 1974, 377); Narežnyj's *Bursak* (Driessen, 1965, 142; Karlinsky, 1976, 31; and Petrov's commentary); Žukovskij's translation of the English ballad "The Witch of Berkeley" (Čiževskij, 1974, I, 117; Gukovskij, 1959, 190); Žukovskij's translation of Lamotte-Fouqué's *Undine* (Karlinsky, 1976, 97ff.); tales

* I wish to thank Michael Bourke, Donald Fanger, George Grabowicz, Paul R. Magocsi, Omeljan Pritsak, and Oleh Ilnytzkyj for criticizing an earlier draft of this article.

from the German Romantics E.T.A. Hoffmann and L. Tieck (Petrov summary). Most important, however, are the motifs from East Slavic folklore, which have been studied in particularly painstaking detail. A summary is to be found in Petrov's commentary (*PSS*, II, 735). Driessen (1965) takes issue with some of Petrov's conclusions and goes on to paraphrase three specific *skazki* to show the extent of Gogol''s borrowing from folk sources. For example, the motifs of the witch's ride on the back of the hero, the three nights of prayer over a dead girl, and the nighttime attack of the evil spirits on the hero are all found in Russian and/or Ukrainian folk texts collected in the nineteenth century. A detailed discussion of the folkloric prototypes for *Vij* (in particular the *Skazka ob Ivane Bykoviče, Skazka o Vasilii Careviče*, a Vjatsk *skazka*, the Belorussian *Praz Illjušku*, and stories about the witch Baba Jaga) is also given by Ivanov (1971; 1973). The following example, cited by Ivanov, demonstrates how Gogol' might have come up with the idea of Vij as a demon with long eyelashes that have to be lifted by someone else:

> Старик лежит на железной кровати, ничего не видит: длинные ресницы и густые брови совсем глаза закрывают. Позвал он двенадцать могучих богатырей и стал им приказывать: "Возьмите-ка вилы железные, подымите мои брови и ресницы черные, я погляжу, что он за птица, что убил моих сыновей?" Богатыри подняли ему брови и ресницы вилами; старик взглянул: "Ай да молодец Ванюша! Дак это ты взял смелость с моими детьми управиться! Что же мне с тобою делать?"
>
> (from *Skazka ob Ivane Bykoviče*, as quoted from the Afanas'ev collection by Ivanov, 1973, 153)

Despite all the parallels and influences, however, *Vij* can still be studied as a *relatively independent* literary entity:

> "Viy" which has borrowed so many motifs from certain fairy-tales, even important features of its construction, nevertheless in no way gives the impression of being a fairy-tale, or even of being a free adaptation thereof. There are various reasons for this which can all be summarised into a single formula. In "Viy," Gogol' has, in spite of his solemn assurance to the opposite, not retold a folk-tale more or less faithfully. He has, on the contrary, used material from a fairy-tale for writing a short story. That means that two genres have crossed here which, however often they may in 18th and 19th century literature be inextricably intertwined, form the opposite of one another.
>
> (Driessen, 1965; cf. Luckyj, 1971, 113)

Furthermore, *Vij* is independent not only on the level of genre. It is independent on the level of psychology, as well. That is, it is possible for the reader to form a complex, analyzable psychological reaction to the

story without his necessarily having a scholarly knowledge of the subtexts (Magarshak's reaction is an example of such unawareness, for he says: "... Russian scholars have failed to trace a single folk-lore story which bears any resemblance to *Viy*" [Magarshak, 1957, 125]). Indeed, knowledge of the (especially folkloric) subtexts will be rather unlikely in most of Gogol''s readers. Gogol''s tale hints at a folkloric background, but the reader is not required to *know* that background in order to appreciate the tale in all of its artistic excellence and psychological complexity (cf. my comments on the theory of subtextology in *Five Russian Poems*, 1977). *Vij* is, as Luckyj says, "Gogol''s Ukrainian masterpiece in which the folk tale form conveys ideally a *universal* theme" (1971, 113, emphasis added). Or, as Karlinsky says: "the mythology of "Viy" is not that of the Ukrainian people, but that of Nikolai Gogol's subconscious" (1976, 87).

The present study will first examine *Vij* as an entity relatively independent of its subtexts, that is, as a story which appeals to the psychological universals in every reader. A hitherto unnoticed subtext will then be discussed, and the special place *Vij* had in Gogol''s own unconscious will be considered. Throughout, the analysis will focus on the identity of Vij, the character who does not appear in full dress until the very end of the story, but after whom the story is nonetheless named. Also, the analysis will be based on the reworked (1842) version of the story.

A single sentence near the end of Driessen's long, primarily nonpsychoanalytic study of *Vij* neatly summarizes his essentially psychoanalytic conclusion regarding the identity of Vij: "Viy with his iron face is the image of an inexorable father who comes to avenge his son's incest" (1965, 165). Similarly, Ermakov declares that Vij is an "imago otca" (1923, 27; the term "imago" was used by Freud in his early works, and the term "Vater-imago" comes specifically from Jung — cf. the *Standard Edition* of Freud [hereafter *SE*], XI, 181; XII, 100; XIX, 168). The question we must ask now is: where is there any real evidence, especially within the story, for arguing that Vij is a father-imago? Is it possible to arrive at such an important psychoanalytic conclusion using more than just intuition?

Driessen admits that "it is certainly possible to develop this [psychoanalytic] explanation further" (1965, 165), although he declines to do so and does not adduce any direct evidence that Vij is a father-image.[1] McLean's quasi-psychoanalytic study of *Mirgorod* (1958) does not deal

[1] His indirect argument is that if the coitus with the ved'ma/pannočka is Oedipal, then the avenger, Vij, must be a father-imago.

specifically with the identity of Vij, nor do the Adlerian study of Gogol' by Kaus (1912) and the extraordinarily superficial study by Kent (1969). Ermakov's hodge-podge of excited observations and bold assertions (1923, 26–30) cites no evidence from Gogol''s story to demonstrate that Vij is a father-imago. Ivanov (1973, 154) suggests a possible parallel between the "car'-lev" of the *Skazka ob Ivane Bykoviče* as a hostile totemic ancestor of the hero and the Vij of Gogol's story as an avenging father, but he does not develop the parallel and does not delineate the possible father-symbolism of Vij within Gogol''s story. Clearly, a detailed psychoanalytic inquiry into the identity of Vij is in order.

The reader first encounters Vij in the title of the story. Since this proper name will be unknown to the reader, Gogol' then immediately proffers an explanation in a footnote:

> *Вий — есть колоссальное создание простонародного воображения. Таким именем называется у малороссиян начальник гномов, у которого веки на глазах идут до самой земли. Вся эта повесть есть народное предание. Я не хотел ни в чем изменить его и рассказываю почти в такой же простоте, как слышал.
>
> (*PSS*, II, 175)

The standard interpretation of this footnote is that it is "undoubtedly an attempt at mystification" (Setchkarev, 1965, 147; cf. Erlich, 1969, 68, where it is called "a typical Gogolian mystification"). There is, evidently, no "Vij" known to exist in "Little Russian" folklore,[2] nor are there any

[2] Aleksandra Osipovna Rosset (later Smirnova) mentions having heard of a "Vij" from her nurse "Hopka":

> „Le хохолъ est récalcitrant: il ne voulait pas venir chez moi avec Pletneff; il est timide et j'avais envie de lui parler de la Petite-Russie. Enfin Сверчокъ [Puškin] и Быкъ [Žukovskij] l'ont amene chez moi. Je les ai surpris en lui récitant des vers petits-russiens. Cela m'a ravie de parler de l'Oukraine; alors il s'est animé. Je suis sûre que le ciel du Nord lui pèse, какъ шапка, car il est lourd souvent. Je lui ai parlé même de Hopka, qui me faisait si peur avec le Вій. Pouchkine dit que c'est le vampire des grecs et des slaves du midi, chez nous il n'existe pas dans les contes du Nord. Joukovsky, fidèle à l'Allemagne et à Goethe, a récité „die Braut von Korinth".
>
> (Šenrok, I, 322–323)

Supposedly this passage was written in 1830, i.e., at least two years *before* Gogol' is known to have worked on *Vij* (1833). Gogol' himself gives a similar description of this first meeting with Aleksandra Osipovna (diary of Aleksandra Osipovna's daughter, as quoted by Šenrok, I, 333), but he does not mention Vij. Others claim that Aleksandra Osipovna did not meet Gogol' until July of 1831 (commentary to Smirnova, 1929, 398, fn. 39). In another place Smirnova claims she cannot at all remember when she first met Gogol', and then proceeds to describe their Paris meetings in 1837 (Smirnova, 1929, 311). In any case, since Gogol' did not make Puškin's acquaintance till May of

"gnomes" in Slavic folklore in general. The footnote is thus likely to be a pseudo-documentary device designed to build up certain expectations. The reader is left hanging with an extremely rudimentary and undeveloped idea of who Vij is, and must read through some 50 pages before Vij reappears, i.e., the reader is made to wait until the bulk of the narration has already been accomplished.

In the meantime, however, the reader does not completely forget the introductory footnote. Or rather, he does not allow his memory of Vij to be unaffected by the developing narration. In the back of his mind there is constantly the question: what does this Vij have to do with all the mysterious events in the story — e.g., the ride over the steppe with the witch, the death of the Cossack captain's daughter, the strange task of reciting prayers over the dead girl for three nights, etc.? The reader cannot resist the temptation to formulate tentative theories that relate Vij to the ongoing narration. Perhaps Vij is in cahoots with the ved'ma/pannočka? Perhaps Vij has something to do with the insistent, threatening sotnik? Not until the very end does the reader's aching curiosity seem to be satisfied. Thus, even as Vij casts his devastating glance upon Xoma Brut and cries out "Vot on!," so, too, the reader casts his glance at the image Gogol' has finally developed and exclaims to himself with epistemophilic glee: "Vot on! Vot Vij!"

But there is something about this exclamation by our reader that does not quite ring true. The force of the exclamation is incommensurate with the paltriness of Gogol''s portrayal of Vij. If the reader were asked to describe just who Vij is, he would only be able to reiterate the few meager details Gogol' provides: the heavy footsteps, the large stature, the covering of black earth, the long, drooping eyelids, the iron face and hand, and the mere seven words which Vij utters. In no sense is Vij developed as a character and in no obvious way is his entrance into the narration motivated. As Driessen observes, ". . . the appearance of this figure represents a sharp break in the composition" (1965, 164).

1831, the above anecdote from Aleksandra Osipovna's diary could not possibly have taken place in 1830. Given the confusion that still exists as to the time of the first meeting, and given Aleksandra Osipovna's questionable ability to report the facts, we cannot decide for certain whether Aleksandra Osipovna actually had heard about Vij before Gogol' wrote his story or imagined that she had heard about Vij once she heard his story. We should also keep in mind that Gogol' might possibly have told her the story before he wrote it. In any case, until Aleksandra Osipovna's claim to have heard of Vij from her nurse is thoroughly disproven, there will always exist the thread of a possibility that Vij really is (or was) a character in Ukrainian folklore.

We therefore have to search for a less than obvious motivation for the entrance of Vij. This can be accomplished by turning, for the time being, away from the question of who Vij is and toward the question of what Vij does. Immediately an answer becomes obvious: Vij is responsible for the death of Xoma Brut. But the threat of death had already been presented to Xoma earlier in the narration:

„Я не о том жалею, моя наймилейшая мне дочь, что ты во цвете лет своих, не дожив положенного века, на печаль и горесть мне оставила землю. Я о том жалею, моя голубонька, что не знаю того, кто был, лютый враг мой, причиною твоей смерти. И если бы я знал, кто мог подумать только оскорбить тебя, или хоть бы сказал что-нибудь неприятное о тебе, то, клянусь богом, не увидел бы он больше своих детей, если только он так же стар, как и я; ни своего отца и матери, если только он еще на поре лет, и тело его было бы выброшено на съедение птицам и зверям степным.

(*PSS*, II, 198)

The reader knows that Xoma is responsible for the death of this daughter, so that the eventual death of Xoma can be taken as a fulfillment of the father's death threat. The fact that it is Vij, not the father, who actually fulfills the threat does not change the fact that the death threat is fulfilled. There has merely been a displacement ("Verschiebung," Freud would say in *Die Traumdeutung*) from one agent of the killing to another. The fatal deed is done, and the reader tends to equate the actual doer of the deed with the potential doer of the deed because the former has fulfilled the latter's wish. The reader's voyeuristic exclamation near the end of the story is thus as much a recognition ("uznavanie" — Potebnja) of the father's previous death threat as it is a recognition of the Vij whom Gogol' had previously introduced in a footnote. We have made at least one step toward the identification of Vij.

The manner in which the death threat is phrased relates to Xoma's death in a rather interesting way. The father states that if he were to find out who had killed his daughter, the killer would never again *see* ("ne *uvidel* by") his children or his parents. That is, the death would be constituted specifically by a kind of visual abeyance between generations. But note that the way in which Vij accomplishes the murder of Xoma is also by *seeing* Xoma:

„Подымите мне веки: не вижу!" сказал подземным голосом Вий — и всё сонмище кинулось подымать ему веки. „Не гляди!" шепнул какой-то внутренний голос философу. Не вытерпел он, и глянул.

„Вот он!" закричал Вий и уставил на него железный палец. И все, сколько ни было, кинулись на философа. Бездыханный грянулся он на землю, и тут же вылетел дух из него от страха.

(*PSS*, II, 217)

The semantic category of "seeing/not-seeing" (Ivanov's "kategorija 'vidimogo' i 'nevidimogo'") is thus inseparably linked with the notion of death in both the father's death threat and in the fulfillment of the threat — which is to say that yet another link between Vij and the father of the ved'ma/pannočka has been established.

Let us compare, incidentally, the way Xoma Brut perceives Vij with the following excerpt from a psychoanalytic patient's dream about death: "Father's eyes are wide open, terrifying. He raises his finger and yells at me just as he does in reality" (Gutheil, 1951, 393). The similarity to Gogol''s Vij is remarkable — the open eyes, the pointing finger, the loud voice. In the dream, however, the threatening figure is literally the patient's father, whereas in Gogol''s story the threatening figure is Vij, an alleged father-imago.

The notion of "seeing/not seeing" and, more particularly, a development of the eye-motif is to be observed not only in connection with the father of the ved'ma/pannočka and with Vij, but also in passages where the ved'ma/pannočka herself interacts with Xoma:

> When the witch visits Homa in the stall, the first thing that alarms him is that "he noticed a strange glitter in her eyes." The eyes of the *rusalka* whom he sees when hovering above the earth are "clear, sparkling, keen." The eyes of the witch transformed into the beautiful girl are full of tears, those of the dead girl are of course closed, but it seems to Homa as if she is nevertheless looking at him, and from under one of her eyelids there appears a tear which is a drop of blood. The dead eyes open when she has risen up out of the coffin. They become more and more terrible. The second night they are green, yet they see nothing. Homa's fear is nevertheless to the greatest extent a fear of being seen, a fear of eyes.
>
> (Driessen, 1965, 162)

Note that the most salient characteristic of Vij, his (twice-mentioned) "dlinnye *veki* . . . opuščeny do samoj zemli" relates in an especially direct way to the following descriptions of the ved'ma/pannočka:

> Перед ним лежала красавица с растрепанною роскошною косою, с длинными как стрелы *ресницами.*
>
> (*PSS*, II, 188)

> . . . *ресницы,* упавшие стрелами на щеки. . . .
>
> (*PSS*, II, 199)

> Ему даже показалось, как будто из-под *ресницы* правого глаза ее покатилась слеза. . . .
>
> (*PSS*, II, 207)

With so close a semantic affinity between "veko" and "resnica," it now becomes possible to link up Vij with the ved'ma/pannočka. And for the reader who happens to know Ukrainian this linkage is reinforced by the

fact that the Ukrainian words for Russian "resnica," i.e., "vijka" and "vija," are akin, both phonetically and morphologically, to the name of Gogol"s demon, Vij.[3] Most importantly, however, the linkage between Vij and the ved'ma/pannočka is emphasized by the last words which the ved'ma/pannočka utters in the story: "Privedite Vija! Stupajte za Viem!" — implying that Vij is to act as some kind of representative for *her,* as *her* agent. Vij is taking revenge for the ved'ma/pannočka herself as well as for the father. Vij is thus Gogol"s fantasmatic way of representing *both* the ved'ma/pannočka and her father. There is even a kind of death threat associated with the ved'ma/pannočka, not only with the father: while Xoma is waiting for daylight hours to pass he hears the story of Mikita the huntsman, who had been burned to ashes because he had galloped around a field with the ved'ma/pannočka. But Xoma, too, had galloped with the ved'ma/pannočka, so the reader understands this tale within a tale as another threat that Xoma must die.

At this point it is worthwhile to recall that the psychoanalytic literature has dealt rather extensively with the symbolic signification of the eye and of "seeing/not seeing": Ferenczi, 1913; Eder, 1913; Reitler, 1913; *SE,* XVII, 227ff; Jones, 1951, 120, 288–290. Ermakov in particular shows an awareness of the fact that the eye and seeing have specific psychoanalytic consequences in Gogol"s works, but his analysis is so disjointed and incomplete that it will be necessary to re-argue and complete what he is trying to say (Stillman has also written on the "all-seeing eye" in Gogol', but has not looked into the psychoanalytic consequences of his investigation: Stillman, 1974).

Basically, psychoanalysts find that the eye can serve either of two opposite symbolic functions: in an afferent, receptive representation the eye becomes a feminine symbol, whereas in an efferent, aggressive representation the eye is a masculine symbol. More specifically, the eye can in one context represent the vagina, but in another context represent the penis. But since it is probably not convincing to merely cite chapter and

[3] Ivanov suggests that the name "Vij" be etymologically connected with the root of Russian "vit'" (Ukrainian "vyty") (note that Ukr. "vijka," "vija" have a similar etymology). Ivanov's proposed etymology would be definitely Ukrainian, *not* Russian. That is, if we were to relate a noun to *Russian* "vit'," the result would be something like "vyvoj" or "razvoj" (cf. "pit'"/"pojlo," "prolit'"/"proloj"), whereas to relate a noun to *Ukrainian* "vyty" could theoretically yield "vij" (cf. "pyty"/"pijlo," "lyty"/"lij"). Stillman (1974, 377) believes that the name "Vij" was most likely derived from Ukrainian "vija," and Karlinsky seconds this proposal by citing Žukovskij's "Struj" from "struja," adding a rather complex argument that also brings in "vuj" ("maternal uncle") (Karlinsky, 1976, 98–103).

verse of the psychoanalytic authorities on this delicate matter, I will instead quote a concrete example of each of the two types of eye-symbolism:

(1) the eye as a feminine symbol:

> A young lady suffered from a phobia of sharp objects, especially needles. Her obsessive fear ran: such an object might sometime put out her eyes. Closer investigation of the case disclosed the fact that the lady had for a number of years lived with her friend in sexual intimacy, but had anxiously guarded against permitting the intermissio penis, which would have impaired her anatomical integrity by rupturing the hymen. All sorts of accidents now kept happening to her, most of which affected the eye; most commonly unintentional self-inflicted injuries with needles. Interpretation: Substitution of the genitals by the eyes, and representation of the wishes and fears relating to the former by accidental actions and phobias relating to the latter.
>
> (Ferenczi, 1913, 161-162, as translated in Ferenczi, 1952, 270)

(2) the eye as a masculine symbol:

> Finally I may relate the case of an obsessional patient who confirmed subsequently my interpretation of Oedipus' self-blinding. As a child he was unusually spoilt, fixed on his parents, but very bashful and modest. One day he learnt from other children the real course of sexual relations between the parents. At this he displayed intense anger at his father, often with the conscious phantasy that he was castrating him (the father), which was always followed, however, by remorse and self-punishment. Now one of these self-punishments was that he destroyed the eyes in his own portrait. I was able to explain to the patient that in doing so he was only expiating in a disguised way the castration he had wished to perform on his father, in accordance with the Mosaic talion threat of punishment, "an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth," which, by the way, takes for example just the two castration symbols, blinding and tooth-extraction.
>
> (Ferenczi, 1913, 163, as translated in Ferenczi, 1952, 274; cf. Freud's analysis of E.T.A. Hoffman's *Sand-Man, SE,* XVII, 227 ff.)

It is the second type of eye-symbolism that is especially relevant to our analysis of Gogol"s *Vij*. Note that in this second type an antagonistic relationship can be involved. Thus, in a psychoanalytic reading, the hostile glance of Vij is an act of phallic aggression, i.e., Vij castrates Xoma Brut with a glance.[4] Now, if we would rather not interpret Vij's glance as

[4] It is interesting to find that both Karlinsky (1976, 95) and Sinjavskij/Terc (1975, 501), without adducing a thread of psychoanalytic evidence, perceive the phallic symbolism of the eye in this scene.

castrating, but rather as just another manifestation of the "evil eye" ("durnoj glaz," "durnoe oko" — cf. Driessen, 1965, 152), then the psychoanalyst would retort: ". . . the principal and original injury that is feared from the evil eye is itself castration" (Flügel, 1924, 188). But still, one might argue, Xoma is killed, not castrated in Gogol"s story. The semantics of the situation might be understood as follows: Vij is a dead man (risen from the grave), and for him to see Xoma is, by a kind of homeopathic magic, to include Xoma among the dead, i.e., to kill Xoma. The contiguity of Vij to Xoma, in other words, seems to breed a semantic similarity process (cf. Laferrière, 1972, on contiguity/similarity processes), and there would not seem to be any need to call the castration complex into the picture at all. Besides, there already exist numerous mythologies, Slavic and otherwise, in which opening of the eyes is a direct signification of death (see Ivanov, 1973, 168; Róheim, 1952, 285).

The latter objection should be rejected, however. There is no reason to assume that the reader of Gogol"s *Vij* will necessarily know, for example, about the Magyar belief that if a dead person opens his eyes another death will soon occur in the family (see Róheim, 1952, 285). Vij's behavior cannot be *explained* by parallels from other mythologies. Rather, we would hope that the various mythological manifestations of a certain class of acts, including Vij's fatal look at Xoma Brut, be explainable on the basis of some psychological universal. Now, the castration complex is held by many to be a psychological universal, and is related to death in the following manner: the phallus is a *pars pro toto,* as Ferenczi has indicated in his notion of "Identifizierung des ganzen Organismus mit dem Exekutivorgan" (1972, II, 351),[5] and destruction of the *pars* is therefore equivalent to destruction of the *totum,* i.e., castration is equivalent to death insofar as the phallus is a synecdoche. If we interpret Vij's look as castrating Xoma, then the fact that Xoma dies is predictable from the synecdochic function of the phallus.

On the other hand the "contiguity breeds similarity" principle seems to be a psychological universal as well (cf. Laferrière, 1977): Xoma Brut's death would be just as predictable on the basis of his intensified contiguity

[5] Kovalev's nose is a *pars pro toto* in Gogol"s *Nos.* The nose plays the role of a whole person — it walks around, wears clothing, speaks, etc. Kovalev even says: ". . . ja vam . . . delaju ob"javlenie . . . o sobstvennom moem nose: stalo byt', počti to že, čto o samom sebe." (*PSS,* III, 61). Such a passage corroborates the synecdochic function of what has long been established to be Kovalev's phallus. Fortunately for Kovalev, he retrieves his phallus, and does not therefore have to die. Akakij Akakievič, on the other hand, never retrieves his phallic "šinel'," and is obliged to die.

with the dead man as on the basis of the castration complex. For the moment, then, we should leave open the possible relevance of castration to Vij's fatal glance, and turn instead to the scene which caused Vij to take vengeance in the first place, namely, to the conclusion of the strange nighttime encounter between Xoma and the ved'ma/pannočka. Erlich (1969, 63), who wisely does not share Nabokov's condescending attitude toward the Ukrainian tales, calls this "one of the most spellbinding sequences in all of Gogol'":

„Что это?" думал философ Хома Брут, глядя вниз, несясь во всю прыть. Пот катился с него градом. Он чувствовал бесовски-сладкое чувство, он чувствовал какое-то пронзающее, какое-то томительно-страшное наслаждение. Ему часто казалось, как будто сердца уже вовсе не было у него, и он со страхом хватался за него рукою. Изнеможенный, растерянный, он начал припоминать все, какие только знал, молитвы. Он перебирал все заклятия против духов и вдруг почувствовал какое-то освежение; чувствовал, что шаг его начинал становиться ленивее, ведьма как-то слабее держалась на спине его. Густая трава касалась его, и уже он не видел в ней ничего необыкновенного. Светлый серп светил на небе.

„Хорошо же!" подумал про себя философ Хома и начал почти вслух произносить заклятия. Наконец, с быстротою молнии выпрыгнул из-под старухи и вскочил в свою очередь к ней на спину. Старуха мелким дробным шагом побежала так быстро, что всадник едва мог переводить дух свой. Земля чуть мелькала под ним. Все было ясно при месячном, хотя и неполном свете. Долины были гладки, но всё от быстроты мелькало неясно и сбивчиво в его глазах. Он схватил лежавшее на дороге полено и начал им со всех сил колотить старуху. Дикие вопли издала она; сначала были они сердиты и угрожающи, потом становились слабее, приятнее, чище, и потом уже тихо, едва звенели, как тонкие серебряные колокольчики, и заронялись ему в душу; и невольно мелькнула в голове мысль: точно ли это старуха? „Ох, не могу больше!" произнесла она в изнеможении, и упала на землю. Он стал на ноги и посмотрел ей в очи: рассвет загорался, и блестели золотые главы вдали киевских церквей. Перед ним лежала красавица с растрепанною роскошною косою, с длинными, как стрелы, ресницами. Бесчувственно отбросила она на обе стороны белые нагие руки и стонала, возведя кверху очи, полные слез. Затрепетал, как древесный лист, Хома: жалость и какое-то странное волнение и робость, неведомые ему самому, овладели им; он пустился бежать во весь дух.

(*PSS*, II, 187–188; cf. the similar ride in the Ukrainian tale "Vid'ma ta vid'mak"—Šenrok, II, 174)

First of all, there is no doubt in the reader's mind that this is a sexual encounter. Even as "un-psychoanalytic" a critic as Setchkarev (1965) perceives the eroticism of the encounter (the anti-Freudian Močul'skij calls *Vij* the most erotic of Gogol''s works). Given the voluptuous sensa-

tions which both Xoma and the witch experience, the sexual symbolism of running and flying (*SE,* XI, 125–126; XV, 155) cannot but reach the consciousness of the reader. Moreover, there is a sado-masochistic coloring to the eroticism of the encounter, as has already been noticed by McLean (1958, 235–236), Erlich (1969, 65), Karlinsky (1976), and Ermakov (1923, 27; see also Kaus's observations on lovemaking as battle ["Kampf"] in Gogol''s works — 1912, 57ff.). Thus Xoma takes voluptuous pleasure in being furiously ridden by the woman (masochism from Xoma's viewpoint), and the woman takes pleasure in being beaten by Xoma's stick (masochism from the woman's viewpoint). Conversely, we assume that the woman takes pleasure in striking Xoma with her broom and riding him across the steppe (sadism from the woman's viewpoint), and that Xoma takes pleasure in beating the woman (sadism from Xoma's viewpoint) — an act that eventually results in the woman's death. The sado-masochistic components of the encounter between Xoma and the ved'ma/pannočka are what make us perceive the encounter as "evil." It seems, indeed, that it is impossible for a sexual encounter in Gogol''s works to be merely "good" or "beautiful," unless the encounter is not between real persons, but between personified elements of nature, as in the embrace of earth and sky in the beginning of *Soročinskaja jarmarka* (cf. McLean, 1958, 226). Likewise, it is impossible for a woman to be merely "beautiful" in Gogolian narrative without her also being "evil." When the sado-masochistic associations with a woman's beauty come too close to consciousness, the beauty is perceived as "terrible" or "demonic." Thus in his analysis of *Vij,* Gippius speaks of the invasion of the demonic into feminine beauty (1924, 49).

The sadistic element of the encounter between Xoma and the ved'ma/pannočka is particularly relevant to the above-discussed problem of castration, for a sadistic conception of coitus is very typical in childhood and involves the act of castration:

> The third of the typical sexual theories arises in children if, through some chance domestic occurrence, they become witnesses of sexual intercourse between their parents [what for the child is the so-called "primal scene"]. Their perceptions of what is happening are bound, however, to be only very incomplete. Whatever detail it may be that comes into their observation — whether it is the relative positions of the two people, or the noises they make, or some accessory circumstance — children arrive in every case at the same conclusion. They adopt what may be called a *sadistic view of coition.* They see it as something that the stronger participant is forcibly inflicting on the weaker, and they (especially boys) compare it to the romping familiar to them from their childish experience. . . .
>
> (*SE,* IX, 220)

What the child imagines (and what he can never totally abandon in adulthood, for infantile theories of sexuality tend to persist in the unconscious) is that the "stronger participant" does physical damage to the "weaker," and this damage is usually pictured as damage specifically to the genitalia. The fantasies characteristic of certain kinds of neurosis are a good example:

> To many neurotics coitus appears to be . . . an act especially dangerous to their genitals, an act in which therefore the desire for satisfaction is associated with great fear. The intent to kill pursues, at least in part, the aim of eliminating the moment of fear by rendering the love-object harmless in advance, so that pleasure can be had without castration anxiety. In these fantasies of attack primarily external weapons are used against the woman (knives, daggers, or lesser-regarded body parts, especially the hand for strangling), and only then is coitus carried out, that is, the penis is used as a weapon only against an object that has been rendered harmless.
>
> (Ferenczi, 1972, II, 165; cf. also Flügel, 1924, 176; Róheim, 1934, 47)

The conception of "coitus as a battle, in which the prize is a penis" (Brown, 1966, 63) is precisely the one the narrator is laboring to disguise in his description of Xoma Brut's encounter with the ved'ma/pannočka. The phallic icon which Xoma sadistically wields is the stick ("poleno" — see *SE*, XV, 154), whereas the phallic icon which the ved'ma/pannočka wields is her broom ("metla" — see Róheim, 1934, 111, 147). In the end Xoma is victorious in the battle (Gukovskij, 1951, 189, speaks of "pobeda Bruta"). That is, the phallic witch is castrated and, through the operation of the phallic synecdoche which was discussed above, she is obliged to die (note that Gogol' emphasizes Xoma Brut's responsibility for her death by making her die on the very night Xoma arrives back at the "xutor").

If there was some doubt that castration was involved in Xoma's encounter with Vij (see above, 219–20), perhaps now there is less doubt that castration plays a role in Xoma's violent sexual encounter with the ved'ma/pannočka. We all cringe slightly at the sado-masochism of the encounter precisely because we would rather not be reminded of an archaic, now obviously incorrect theory of coitus as castration (Belinskij cringed for the same reason when he spoke of the story's "neudača v fantastičeskom" in 1835). Furthermore, because we perceive the encounter between Vij and Xoma as a kind of Talion revenge ("an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth"), it is appropriate that the fantasy basis of *this* encounter be the same as the fantasy basis of the encounter between the ved'ma/pannočka and Xoma, i.e., that it be a castration fantasy. In any case, psychoanalysis has always regarded the Talion law as grounded in

the castration complex: "an eye for an eye" (e.g., the blinding of Oedipus) is really "a phallus for a phallus." In the present case it is Xoma's phallus for the witch's phallus, Xoma's castration for the witch's castration, or, *by phallic synecdoche,* Xoma's life for the witch's life. Whether Vij represents the father of the daughter or the daughter herself in fulfilling the Talion law makes no difference as far as the castration is concerned. If Vij is the father, then Vij is taking revenge for what happened between Xoma and the ved'ma/pannočka. If Vij is the ved'ma/pannočka herself, then she is taking her own revenge. The best solution at this point would be to regard Vij as a *composite* of both the father and the daughter, for, as was already shown, Vij possesses characteristics of both these persons. That is, Vij is best regarded as a condensation or composite person ("Verdichtung," "Sammelperson" — cf. my analysis of Freud's dream of Irma's injection, Laferrière, 1972). We can begin to understand the identity of Vij by thus applying one of the basic principles of dream analysis. This is not to say, however, that we have as yet discovered all the elements that go into the composition of Vij, nor have we yet investigated how the various elements relate to Xoma Brut's personal history.

At this point the opponent of the "castration theory" of Vij's revenge will demonstrate a knowledge of psychoanalysis as follows: the castration complex does not at all enter into normal adult sexual relationships and generally plays no role in adulthood unless there is some neurotic fixation on a primitive stage of sexual development. And Xoma Brut seems to be quite normal insofar as he is capable of having healthy, nonmorbid sex with women and not anticipating revenge, much less castration, as a result of such sex:

> Однако же философ скоро сыскался, как поправить своему горю: он прошел посвистывая раза три по рынку, перемигнулся на самом конце с какою-то молодою вдовою в желтом очипке, продававшею ленты, ружейную дробь и колеса — и был того же дня накормлен пшеничными варениками, курицею . . . и словом перечесть нельзя, что у него было за столом, накрытым в маленьком глиняном домике, среди вишневого садика. Того же самого вечера видели философа в корчме: он лежал на лавке, покуривая, по обыкновению своему, люльку, и при всех бросил жиду-корчмарю ползолотой. Перед ним стояла кружка. Он глядел на приходивших и уходивших хладнокровно-довольными глазами и вовсе уже не думал о своем необыкновенном происшествии.
>
> (*PSS,* II, 188)

But that is the *other* Xoma Brut, the one who is ". . . the most full-blooded, sensible, and psychologically healthy of Gogol's protagonists" (Karlinsky, 1976, 88). As has already been observed (e.g., Gukovskij, 1951,

187ff.) there are really *two* Xomas: one, the "nighttime," neurotic Xoma (both the encounter with the ved'ma/pannočka and the encounter with Vij take place at night), the indulger in highly charged erotic and terrifying fantasies; the other, the "daytime" Xoma, the jolly prankster, thief, drunkard, and indulger in various kinds of "pošlost'." The opposition is brought out in particularly clear fashion in the interview with the father of the ved'ma/pannočka:

„Какже ты познакомился с моею дочкою?"

„Не знакомился, вельможный пан, ей богу, не знакомился. Еще никакого дела с панночками не имел, сколько ни живу на свете. Цурь им, чтобы не сказать непристойного."

„Отчего же она не другому кому, а тебе именно назначила читать?"

Философ пожал плечами: „Бог его знает, как это растолковать. Известное уже дело, что панам подчас захочется такого, чего и самый наиграмотнейший человек не разберет; и пословица говорит: „Скачи, враже, як пан каже!"

„Да не врешь ли ты, пан философ?"

„Вот на этом самом месте пусть громом так и хлопнет, если лгу."

„Если бы только минуточкой долее прожила ты", грустно сказал сотник: „то верно бы я узнал всё. „Никому не давай читать по мне, но пошли, тату, сей же час в киевскую семинарию и привези бурсака Хому Брута. Пусть три ночи молится по грешной душе моей. Он знает . . ." А что такое знает, я уже не услышал. Она, голубонька, только и могла сказать, и умерла. Ты, добрый человек, верно, известен святою жизнию своею и богоугодными делами, и она, может быть, наслышалась о тебе."

„Кто? я?" сказал бурсак, отступивши от изумления: „я святой жизни?" произнес он, посмотрев прямо в глаза сотнику. „Бог с вами, пан! Что вы это говорите! да я, хоть оно непристойно сказать, ходил к булочнице против самого страстного четверга."

(*PSS*, II, 196–197)

The Xoma who claims "Ešče nikakogo dela s pannočkami ne imel" is the Xoma who fears the consequences of relations with women (virgins in particular), who holds women in excessively high esteem, who is still fixated, in short, on a primitive view of relations with women (which is not to deny that his ideas may be socially determined). But the Xoma who visits the baker's wife "protiv samogo strastnogo četverga" is healthy and mature, and is not at all fixated on primitive ideas, be they sadistic or Oedipal. It is the latter Xoma Brut who lives in an "everyday space" ("bytovoe prostranstvo" — Lotman, 1968, 35), who gives comic relief to the reader, who helps the reader recover from the highly regressive and ego-distonic fantasies of the Xoma Brut who acts in a "cosmic, open-ended space" ("vsestoronne-razomknutoe prostranstvo" — Lotman, 1968, 36). Gogol' defensively balances the "daytime" or everyday Xoma

against the cosmic, "nighttime" Xoma in such a way that the reader is free to avoid the symbolic consequences of Xoma's "nighttime" activities, and is always in the protected ontological position of being able to say: "but that's not what *really* is happening on the *objective* level!"

We should note that the "daytime" Xoma, the Xoma who vigorously denies having had anything to do with "pannočki," is not quite telling the truth. Lying is, in fact, one of the devices whereby Gogol' keeps his two Xomas apart. The reader knows, after all, of the earlier incident with the ved'ma/pannočka and interprets the vigor of Xoma's denial as "protesting too much." Xoma's protest, moreover, leads the reader to cast retrospective doubt on the three denials of the immediately preceding discourse:

Хома и козак почтительно остановились у дверей.
„Кто ты, и откудова, и какого звания, добрый человек?" сказал сотник ни ласково, ни сурово.
„Из бурсаков, философ Хома Брут."
„А кто был твой отец?"
„Не знаю, вельможный пан."
„А мать твоя?"
„И матери не знаю. По здравому рассуждению, конечно, была мать; но кто она и откуда, и когда жила — ей богу, добродию, не знаю."
Сотник помолчал и, казалось, минуту оставался в задумчивости.
(*PSS*, II, 196)

We ask: if Xoma has a memory block concerning the ved'ma/pannočka, might he also have a memory block concerning his parents? The parallel is especially emphasized by repeated play on the verbal root morpheme {-znaj-} in both Xoma's denial of any knowledge about his parents and in his denial of having anything to do with the pannočka:

Parents: — Не *знаю*, вельможный пан.
— И матери не *знаю*.
— . . . была мать; но кто она и откуда, и когда жила — ей богу, добродию, не *знаю*.

Pannočka: — Какже ты *познакомился* с моею дочкою?
— Не *знакомился*, вельможный пан, ей богу, не *знакомился*.
— Бог его *знает*, как это растолковать.

The allegation that Xoma does "not know" various things is about to be belied by the pannočka herself, in the subsequent indirect discourse of the father:

Пусть три ночи молится по грешной душе моей. Он *знает*. . .

But she expires at that very moment, so that just *what* it is that he knows is omitted from her discourse, i.e., she in effect mimics his denials with an

iconically strategic abeyance of her own discourse. Indeed the abeyance is almost a parody of his denials and it distinctly reinforces our feeling that Xoma really does know more than he is willing to admit, either to himself or to the sotnik. For one thing, he certainly "knows" (in the biblical sense of the word) the ved'ma/pannočka: perhaps she was going to say "on znaet *menja?*" For another thing, she certainly "knows" him, i.e., she is a "ved'ma," or "one who *knows*" (Dal' includes "ved'ma" in the same word nest as "vedat'" and one of his definitions of "ved'ma" is "spo*znav*šajasja" — Dal', I, 329–330). In any case, the encounter of Xoma with the ved'ma/pannočka is evidence enough that they have carnal knowledge of one another. What Xoma's denials and repetitions of the root morpheme {-znaj-} accomplish is not so much a statement of his sexual experience with the ved'ma/pannočka, which we already know about, but a suggestion that the experience has something to do with his parents, especially his mother. The false denial of any knowledge of the ved'ma/pannočka is *immediately* preceded by the two denials of any knowledge specifically of his mother. What this parallelism suggests is a link between the "{+known}" ved'ma/pannočka and the "{-known}" mother, with a semantic feature "{±known}" (in the biblical sense) acting as tertium comparationis. The postulation of such a link is supported by our earlier discussion of the encounter between Xoma and the ved'ma/pannočka, because the sado-masochistic element of the encounter was seen to be modeled on the infantile notion of coitus as castration of one *parent* by another. If we suspected that the ved'ma/pannočka was a mother-imago in the earlier encounter, the sotnik's interrogation of Xoma supports the suspicion. The function of the interrogation is in fact to establish guilt, to dispel any doubt the reader might have had in his unconscious that the fantastic ride on the steppe was anything less than a euphemism for incest. Once Xoma's guilt is accepted by the reader, then the Talion punishment which follows becomes more acceptable, indeed inevitable.

At the same time the evidence from the interrogation allows us to go beyond the claim that Vij is just a condensation of traits from the ved'ma/pannočka and her father. Vij is now a father-imago on a more profound level because every reader brings to the text an archaic sense of revenge for incest. That is, the reader projects into Vij the father-imago because incest has been committed with a mother-imago, and the father-imago typically is the one to take the Talion revenge. What began in the story as a literal father of the ved'ma/pannočka ends up as a father-imago for Xoma, i.e., becomes Vij.

But this essentially psychoanalytic conclusion as to the identity of Vij

still lacks a crucial ingredient — a motivation for the very name "Vij." This proper name is a peculiar one which evidently did not exist either in Ukrainian or in Russian prior to Gogol''s story (but see above, fn. 2). The usual assumption is that the name is connected by some kind of Gogolian folk etymology to the Ukrainian word for eyelash, "vija," especially since Vij does have long eyelashes. The connection undoubtedly played a role in Gogol''s invention of the name, and is the only connection within the story that the reader is able to make (assuming the reader knows Ukrainian). Curiously, the two characters whose traits contribute most to the makeup of Vij within the story, the ved'ma/pannočka and her father, are themselves *not named.* Is it not strange that two major characters of the story are nameless, whereas such minor characters as the Cossacks Javtux, Doroš, Mikita, etc., have names? Perhaps another element of our sense of recognition at the end of the story ("vot Vij!") is displaced satisfaction of curiosity concerning the names of the ved'ma/pannočka and her father (we have already seen that Vij acts as a condensation of these two characters).

But the question of Vij's name can be answered more concretely if we go outside the text. Specifically, we must (1) examine a hitherto unnoticed subtext, and (2) consider some basic facts of Gogol''s family situation.

(1) First let us examine the subtext. As most critics of Gogol' (except Nabokov) recognize, Gogol' had a real passion for Ukrainian folk songs. Gogol' not only wrote the article "O malorossijskix pesnjax" (1833 — *PSS,* 90-97), but scrupulously copied down in his notebooks a large number of songs which were later collected and published by Georgievskij (1908: the most thorough study of the sources for Gogol''s folk song collection is Krasil'nikov, 1936). The letters which Gogol' wrote during the period when he occupied himself most intensely with Ukrainian folk songs (1833-1834) give a pretty clear picture of how strong his passion was. For example:

> Я очень порадовался, услышав от вас о богатом присовокуплении песень и собрании Ходаковского. Как бы я желал теперь быть с вами и пересмотреть их вместе, при трепетной свече, между стенами, убитыми книгами и книжною пылью, с жадностью жида, считающего червонцы. Моя радость, жизнь моя! песни! как я вас люблю! Что все черствые летописи, в которых я теперь роюсь, пред этими звонкими, живыми летописями!
>
> (to M. A. Maksymovyč, 9 November 1833; *PSS,* X, 284)

Kuliš waxes eloquent (1856, I, 177-179) over the role of Ukrainian folk

songs in Gogol''s literary creativity, and goes so far as to quote thirty-five of Gogol''s favorites (1865, II, 210–215: the list was prepared in collaboration with Gogol''s friends S. T. Aksakov, O. M. Bodjans'kyj, and M. A. Maksymovyč). Of these thirty-five songs, Kuliš names three as Gogol''s very favorites: "Oj bida, bida"; "Oj xodyv čumak"; "Oj u poli mohyla." It is the last of these three which is particularly relevant to Gogol''s *Vij:*

Ой въ по́лѣ моги́ла зъ вѣтромъ говори́ла:
Повѣ́й, вѣ́тре, ты на ме́не, щобъ я́ не чорнѣ́ла.

Щобъ я не чорнѣ́ла, щобъ я не марнѣ́ла,
Щобъ на менѣ́ трава́ росла́, да ще́ й зеленѣ́ла!

И вѣ́теръ не вѣ́е, и со́нце не грѣ́е,
То́льки въ степу́ при доро́зѣ трава́ зеленѣ́е!

Ой у степу́ рѣ́чка, чере́зъ рѣ́чку кла́дка:
Не покида́й, коза́ченьку, рôдне́нького ба́тька!

Якъ ба́тька поки́нешъ, самъ ма́рне заги́нешъ,
Рѣче́нькою быстре́нькою за Дуна́й запли́нешъ.

— Бо-да́й та́я рѣ́чка ры́бы не плоди́ла:
Вона́ мого́ това́риша на-вѣ́ки втопи́ла!

Бо-дай та́я рѣ́чка кошу́ромъ заросла́:
Вона́ мого́ това́риша за Дуна́й занесла́!

(as given in Maksymovyč, 1834)[6]

Let us compare some of the elements from this song with elements from that passage in Gogol''s story describing the last night in Xoma Brut's life. First of all, the singer of the song imagines that a grave ("mohyla") which contains the corpse of a young Cossack is talking with the wind. In Gogol''s tale there is instead a "grob," but in both the song and the story *a dead person is made to speak aloud,* as if still alive. Second, in the song the grave (≈ the dead person) does not want to turn *black* ("Ščob ja ne *čornila*" [repeated]), while in Gogol''s tale the dead person sends for another dead person, Vij, who is covered in *black* ("ves' byl on v *černoj* zemle"). Most striking, however, is the repeated use of the root morpheme {-vij} in the song: "Z *vit*rom hovoryla"; "Po*vij, vit*re" (this phrase occurs often in the songs Gogol' collected); "I *vit*er ne *vie.*" This morpheme {-vij-} is in fact exactly the title of Gogol''s tale. It is as if

[6] Curiously, this song is not given in Gogol''s own notebooks of songs (see Georgievskij, 1908), nor is it to be found in the collections of Wacław of Oles'ko (1833) and Xodakovs'kyj (see Išyna & Bex, 1974), both of which Gogol' knew. It seems reasonable to assume that Gogol' knew the song either from his friend Maksymovyč or from his own childhood experience.

Gogol''s monster who rises from the grave is named after the very words spoken by the dead Cossack in the Ukrainian song. Thus the proposal that the name "Vij" be related to the root of the Ukrainian verb "vyty" ("twist") (above, fn. 3) has to be supplemented with a proposal that the name also be related to the root of the verb "vijaty" ("to blow"). The two verb roots are in fact linguistically identical {-vij-}. Note also that the Ukrainian folk song not only helps us understand where the name "Vij" might have come from, but also accounts for the "podzemnistyj motif" that Ivanov was *not* able to trace in the various East Slavic *skazki* that he studied.

(2) Turning now from the folk song, we may consider another possible determining factor for the name "Vij," i.e., the name of Gogol''s own father, Vasilij. First, the name is given here in Russian because Gogol' seems to have communicated with his parents in Russian — at least he always wrote them in Russian, even as a child, before his father died (for a study of Gogol''s father's death and its effect on Gogol', see Šenrok, 1898). Also, we do have to respect the fact that Gogol' did write his Ukrainian stories in Russian, however much they may owe to Ukrainian settings and subtexts. Now, if we examine the Russian name of Gogol''s father, we find that there are two systematic ways whereby corruption of the name yields "Vij." First, if the phonemes in "Vasilij" are symmetrically extracted, i.e., if the first, the middle, and the last phonemes are removed, the result is "Vij":

/v̱aşí̱ļij̱/ → /v̦ij/

Or, if we consider the standard orthographic abbreviation of "Vasilij," the result is also "Vij":

Василий → В-ий → Вий
(old orthography: **Василій → В-ій → Вій**)

Such a hypothesis connecting the name of Gogol''s father to the name of "Vij" might seem like mere game playing,[7] were it not for the fact that the topic of "name-of-the-father" plays such a large role in psychoanalysis, particularly in Lacanian psychoanalysis (see: *Ecrits*, 577–583; 556–557). For Lacan, the "nom du père" is a signifier that undergoes certain kinds of

[7] Gogol' was fond of such tricks. For example, he signed an early fragment of *Get'man* with the sequence "OOOO," which apparently represents the four "O's" in Nik*o*laj G*o*g*o*l'-Jan*o*vskij.

repression (“foreclusion”) in psychosis, e.g., in the famous Schreber case (*SE*, XII). The name of the father can also “stand in” for the functions performed by the symbolic father in the subject’s unconscious. The religious connection of the name of the father is emphasized by Lacan as follows: “It is in the *name of the father* that we must recognize the support of the Symbolic function which, from the dawn of history, has identified his person with the figure of the law” (as translated in Wilden, 1968, 41). The key word here is “law.” All law emanates from the name of the father. In the case of Gogol'’s *Vij*, the law is God’s law, the Xoma Brut manifests his attempt to adhere to God’s law while in the church on that fatal night by crossing himself twice. That is, he has to have uttered precisely the words “Vo *imja otca*, i syna, i svjatogo duxa. . . .”

Lacan, in a complex (and not always scrutable) argument ties the notion of the law to the death of the subject’s father: “. . . the Symbolic Father, insofar as he signifies [the] Law, is actually the dead Father” (as translated in Wilden, 1968, 270). We thus have a triad of notions,

Name of the Father - - - Law - - - Dead Father,

which, in Gogol'’s *Vij* might have been

Name of God-the-Father - - - God’s Law - - - Dead Father,

but in fact turned out to be

Name of Vij-the-Father - - - Talion Law - - - Dead Father.

That is, the dead father who returns temporarily from the grave is personified as the evil Vij-the-Father rather than as a benevolent God-the-Father because Xoma Brut has violated the most inviolable and universal of laws — the taboo against incest. Xoma calls on God-the-Father, but gets Vij-the-Father instead.

It should be emphasized that the function of Vij, as argued earlier in this essay, is that of a father-imago. The fact that the name of Vij happens to be related to the name of a real father, i.e., Gogol'’s father Vasilij, is a curious piece of supporting evidence from the viewpoint of the story, but in fact tells us more about Gogol' the man than about the workings of his story. Gogol' could have named the monster whatever he pleased, and the reader would still have been led, by the dynamics of the story itself, to subliminally perceive an avenging father-imago in the monster. The advantage of having named the monster “Vij,” however, is that the name *condenses* within itself so many elements (for Gogol', although not always for Gogol'’s reader). That is, the name is *overdetermined* by a multiplicity of factors: the mournful folk song Gogol' loved so well (“Po*vij*, vitre”), the name of Gogol'’s dead father *Vasilij*, the Ukrainian word “vija,” the

howling of the wolves outside the church ("volki *vyli* vdali," "poslyšalos' vdali volč'e za*vyv*an'e"), and other possible factors. Even if the name "Vij" turns out to have existed in Ukrainian folklore before Gogol' wrote his story, the linguistic associations (be they real or "folk" etymologies) with the word "Vij" would still be psychologically real. Just as the figure of Irma in Freud's famous dream is overdetermined despite the existence of a real Irma, so, too, the figure Vij in Gogol''s tale is overdetermined despite the possibility that a real Vij existed in Ukrainian folklore. In particular, the connection with the Ukrainian word "vija" would be just as inescapable whether or not Vij had been a real folk character. The connections with the folk song and with the name of Gogol''s father would also remain, for it was Gogol' himself who made a point of linking Ukrainian folk songs with his dead father:

> Они [малороссийские песни] — *надгробный памятник* былого, более нежели надгробный памятник: камень с красноречивым рельефом, с историческою надписью — ничто против этой живой, говорящей, звучащей о прошедшем летописи. В этом отношении песни для Малороссии — всё: и поэзия, и история, *и отцовская могила.*
>
> ("O malorossijskix pesnjax," *PSS*, VIII, 90–91, emphasis added)

To recapitulate: numerous studies have already revealed most of the sources Gogol' used for his *Vij* — Russian and Ukrainian folk tales, Nareźnyj's *Bursak*, Žukovskij's translation of "The Witch of Berkeley," tales by E.T.A. Hoffmann and L. Tieck, and others. The present study focuses on *Vij* as an entity relatively independent of its subtexts, as a psychologically organic whole which is greater than the sum of its subtextual parts. The question of Vij's identity is raised and a psychoanalytic answer is proposed: Vij represents a condensation of the ved'ma/pannočka who was ravished by Xoma Brut and the sotnik/father who has vowed to take revenge against the ravisher of his daughter. At a deeper level Vij punishes Xoma Brut for having committed incest, i.e., Vij castrates Xoma, and Xoma is obliged to die through phallic synecdoche. The castration/death is accomplished by means of symbolic elements in the semantic category of "seeing/not seeing." This psychoanalytic interpretation does not, however, solve the problem of the very name "Vij," so a new subtext which makes extensive use of the root morpheme {-vij-} is brought into consideration, and the name of Gogol''s father Vasilij is discussed as a possible source because of the important role which the "nom du père" phenomenon plays in Lacanian psychoanalysis. However,

no single suggestion, including the one that Gogol' derived the name from the Ukrainian word "vija" ("eyelash"), is considered definitive. Rather, the name is overdetermined (in the psychoanalytic sense of the word), and this decision leaves open the possibility that Vij might still be a character that existed in Ukrainian folklore.

Tufts University

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abaev, V. I. 1958. "Obraz Vija v povesti N. V. Gogolja," *Russkij fol'klor* 3, 303-307.

Belinskij, V. G. 1954. *Izbrannoe* (Moscow).

Bolte, J. and G. Polívka. 1913-1932. *Anmerkungen zu den Kinder- und Hausmärchen der Brüder Grimm* (Leipzig: Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung), 5 vols.

Brown, Norman O. 1966. *Love's Body* (New York: Vintage).

Čiževskij, Dm. 1974. *History of Nineteenth Century Russian Literature*, trans. Richard Porter, ed. S. A. Zenkovsky (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press), 2 vols.

Dal', Vladimir. 1955 (1880-1882). *Tolkovyj slovar' živogo velikorusskogo jazyka* (Moscow), 4 vols.

Dokusov, A. M. 1963. *Povest' N. V. Gogolja "Vij"* (Leningrad).

Driessen, F. C. 1965. *Gogol' as a Short-Story Writer*, trans. Ian F. Finlay (The Hague: Mouton).

Eder, M. D. 1913. "Augentraume," *Internationale Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse* 1, 157-158.

Erlich, Victor. 1969. *Gogol* (New Haven: Yale University).

Ermakov, Iv. Dm. 1923. *Očerki po analizu tvorčestva N. V. Gogolja* (Moscow-Petrograd).

Ferenczi, Sandor. 1913. "Zur Augensymbolik," *Internationale Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse* 1, 161-164.

________. 1952 (orig. pub. in English 1916). *First Contributions to Psycho-Analysis* (London: Hogarth).

________. 1972 (orig. 1919-1924). *Schriften zur Psychoanalyse* (Frankfurt: S. Fischer).

Flügel, J. C. 1924. "Polyphallic Symbolism and the Castration Complex," *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis* 5, 155-196.

Freud, Sigmund. 1953-1965. *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, trans. and ed. under the direction of James Strachey (London: Hogarth), 24 vols.

Georgievskij, G. P. 1908. *Pamjati V. A. Žukovskogo i N. V. Gogolja* (St. Petersburg), vol. 2.

Gippius, Vasilij. 1924. *Gogol'* (Leningrad).

Gogol', N. V. 1940-1953. *Polnoe sobranie sočinenij* (Moscow: AN SSSR), 14 vols.

Gukovskij, G. A. 1959. *Realizm Gogolja* (Moscow-Leningrad).

Gutheil, Emil A. 1951. *The Handbook of Dream Analysis* (New York: Liveright).

Išyna, N. O. and Z. Bex. 1974. *Ukrajins'ki narodni pisni v zapysax Zoriana Dolenhy-Xodakovs'koho* (Kiev).

Ivanov, V. V. 1971. "Ob odnoj paralleli k gogolevskomu 'Viju,'" *Trudy po znakovym sistemam* 5 (= *Učenye zapiski Tartuskogo gos. Universiteta* 284), 133-142.

________. 1973. "Kategorija 'vidimogo' i 'nevidimogo' v tekste: Ešče raz o vostočnoslavjanskix fol'klornyx paralleljax k gogolevskomu 'Viju'," *Structure of Texts and Semiotics of Culture*, ed. Jan van der Eng and Mojmír Grygar (The Hague: Mouton), 151-176.

Jones, Ernest. 1961. *Papers on Psycho-Analysis* (Boston: Beacon).
Karlinsky, Simon. 1976. *The Sexual Labyrinth of Nikolai Gogol* (Cambridge: Harvard University).
Kaus, Otto. 1912. "Der Fall Gogol," *Schriften des Verein für freie psychoanalytische Forschung* (Munich: Ernst Reinhardt), no. 2.
Kent, Leonard. 1969. *The Subconscious in Gogol' and Dostoevskij, and Its Antecedents* (The Hague: Mouton).
Krasil'nikov, S. A. 1936. "Istočniki sobranija ukrainskix pesen N. V. Gogolja," *N. V. Gogol': Materialy i issledovanija*, ed. V. V. Gippius (Moscow–Leningrad), 2, 377–406.
Kuliš, P. A. 1856. *Zapiski o žizni Nikolaja Va-iča Gogolja* (St. Petersburg), 2 vols.
Lacan, Jacques. 1966. *Ecrits* (Paris: Seuil).
Laferrière, Daniel. 1972. "Similarity and Contiguity Processes in the Dream-Work," *Sub-Stance* 3, 39–52.
__________. 1977. "Contiguity Breeds Similarity," *Proceedings of the Semiotic Society of America* 1, 69–75.
__________. 1977. *Five Russian Poems: Exercises in a Theory of Poetry* (Englewood, New Jersey: Trans-World).
Lotman, Ju. M. 1968. "Problema xudožestvennogo prostranstva v proze Gogolja," *Učenye zapiski Tartuskogo gos. universiteta (Trudy po russkoj i slavjanskoj filologii)* 209, 4–50.
Luckyj, George. 1971. *Between Gogol' and Ševčenko* (Munich: Wilhelm Fink).
Magarshack, David. 1957. *Gogol: A Life* (New York: Grove Press).
Maguire, Robert, ed., trans., introd. 1974. *Gogol from the Twentieth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University).
Maksimovič [Maksymovyč], Mixail. 1834. *Ukrainskija narodnyja pěsni, čast' pervaja* (Moscow).
McLean, Hugh. 1958. "Gogol's Retreat from Love: Towards an Interpretation of *Mirgorod*," *American Contributions to the Fourth International Congress of Slavicists* (The Hague: Mouton), 225–242.
Nabokov, Vladimir. 1944. *Nikolai Gogol* (New York: New Directions).
Reitler, Rudolph. 1913. "Zur Augensymbolik," *Internationale Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse* 1, 160–161.
Róheim, Géza. 1934. *The Riddle of the Sphinx* (London: Hogarth).
__________. 1952. *The Gates of the Dream* (New York: IUP).
Setchkarev, Vsevolod. 1965. *Gogol: His Life and Works* (New York: New York University).
Sinyavsky, Andrei. 1975. *In the Shadow of Gogol* (*V teni Gogolja*) (London: Overseas Publications Interchange and Collins).
Smirnova, A. O. 1929. *Zapiski, dnevnik, vospominanija, pis'ma*, ed. M. A. Cjavlovskij (Moscow).
Stillman, Leon. 1974 (1967). "The 'All-Seeing Eye' in Gogol," *Gogol from the Twentieth Century*, ed., trans., introd. Robert Maguire (Princeton: Princeton University), 376–389.
Šenrok, V. I. 1892–1898. *Materialy dlja biografii Gogolja* (Moscow), 4 vols.
__________. 1898. *Učeniskie gody Gogolja* (2nd ed., Moscow).
Wacław z Oleska. 1833. *Pieśni polskie i ruskie ludu galicyjskiego* (L'viv).
Wilden, Anthony. 1968. *The Language of the Self* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University).

VOLUNTARY ARTISAN ASSOCIATIONS AND THE UKRAINIAN NATIONAL MOVEMENT IN GALICIA (THE 1870s)*

JOHN-PAUL HIMKA

For the Ukrainians of Galicia, the decisive stage of national development that transforms a people from an ethnically differentiated folk into a conscious nation occurred in the latter nineteenth century, roughly from the 1860s until the turn of the century. In this period, the Ukrainian national movement grew from the affair of a small group of intellectuals into an institutionalized mass movement, with its own periodicals and organizations and with large-scale peasant participation. Although this period of institutional development was crucial in the formation of the modern Ukrainian nation, little attention has been paid to it in Ukrainian historical literature.[1] The present study intends to help overcome this deficiency by examining a single species of institution, the voluntary artisan association, and its role in the Ukrainian national movement in the 1870s.

Artisan participation in a national movement's institutional development is a problem of some consequence. A Czech scholar, Miroslav Hroch, has studied the process of institutional development in a variety of national movements. Using subscription lists and membership lists of national periodicals and organizations, Hroch analyzed and compared the social composition of national movements among many of the small nations of Europe. On the basis of this wide-ranging comparison, he concluded that the participation of merchants and artisans in national

* I am grateful to the International Research and Exchanges Board and the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for financing the research on which this study is based. The article is a revised version of a paper presented at the Seminar in Ukrainian Studies held at Harvard University, 28 April 1977.

[1] A notable exception is the outstanding, but largely forgotten, history of reading clubs written by Mykhailo Pavlyk in the mid-1880s. M. Pavlyk, "Pro rus'ko-ukrains'ki narodni chytal'ni," in his *Tvory* (Kiev, 1959), pp. 416–549.

institutions appears to determine the overall viability of a national movement. He pointed out that merchants and artisans were notably absent in the national institutions of peoples who never quite crossed the threshold into nationhood (Bretons, Sorbs, and Kashubians) or took a long time to do so (Belorussians and the Welsh). Hroch calls merchants and craftsmen "the most important bearers of the nationalism of a fully developed nation ... and a potential source for its ruling class."[2]

To what degree artisan and merchant participation determines the long-range viability of a national movement is a question that goes beyond the limits of this particular study. However, this study does suggest that the presence or absence of an urban constituency, of which, in preindustrial society, artisans would be a major component, could affect the strength, pace of development, and ideology of a particular national movement.

The article has three parts. The first provides a general background for the rest of the study. The second focuses on one artisan association, in L'viv, and attempts to make explicit some unstated assumptions about why it emerged and why it collapsed. The third compares the development of the association in L'viv with that of its counterparts in small towns; the comparison yields some inferences about the difference between a national movement recruiting its mass constituency in the city and one recruiting its constituency in the countryside.

I

Defining an artisan can be troublesome because one can approach the definition from so many angles. In the descriptive approach one could list all professions included in the term: furriers and farriers, cobblers and coopers, braziers, glaziers, and the like. Or one could define the artisan according to his method of production, referring to the absence of both machinery and division of labor. Then again, one might define the artisan in terms of the size of his workshop, establishing ten workers, for instance, as the upper limit which, when exceeded, marks the transition from artisanal production to manufacture. Then again, one might say that the distinguishing characteristic of the artisan is production on order, in contrast to production for an impersonal market. Although all these defini-

[2] Miroslav Hroch, *Die Vorkämpfer der nationalen Bewegung bei den kleinen Völkern Europas: Eine vergleichende Analyse zur gesellschaftlichen Schichtung der patriotischen Gruppen* (Prague, 1968), p. 125.

tions are useful, for our specific purposes an artisan can best be defined as the practitioner of a trade regulated or formerly regulated by a guild.

Guilds existed in Galicia until 1860, when they were abolished throughout the Habsburg realm.[3] Perhaps the abolition of guilds had lesser repercussions in industrialized Bohemia and Vienna than it did in the industrially undeveloped crownland of Galicia. For in Galicia, the artisan's workshop, not the factory, dominated local industry. This is borne out by the Austrian census of 1869, which recorded only 1.7 workers for every "industrial" employer in Galicia.[4] Although artisans monopolized Galician production, they by no means monopolized the Galician market, which from 1860 on became increasingly dominated by Viennese and Bohemian factory imports.[5] The abolition of the guilds had left artisanal production, and therefore Galician "industry" as a whole, completely disorganized in the face of factory competition. The need for organization was sorely felt, not only by the artisans themselves, but also by patriotic intellectuals worried about the rapid degeneration of native industry.[6]

In place of the guilds, in which artisans' membership had been compulsory, voluntary associations for artisans now appeared in Galicia. Such voluntary artisan associations proliferated especially after the emperor promulgated a liberal law on associations and a democratic constitution in 1867. In the 1860s and early 1870s, some fifteen voluntary artisan associations were active in L'viv alone, while most smaller towns, from Cracow to Hlyniany, boasted at least one voluntary association for artisans. The

[3] "Kaiserliches Patent vom 20. December 1859 ... Gewerbe-Ordnung," *Reichs-Gesetz-Blatt für das Kaisertum Oesterreich,* 1859, pp. 619–44.

[4] All statistics from the 1869 census are taken from *Bevölkerung und Viehstand von Galizien nach der Zählung vom 31. December 1869* (Vienna, 1871). Statistics concerning occupation were also published in *Bevölkerung und Viehstand der im Reichsrathe vertretenen Königreiche und Länder ... Nach der Zählung vom 31. December 1869,* pt. 2: *Bevölkerung nach dem Berufe und der Beschäftigung* (Vienna, 1871). The Galician statistics for 1869 are also reproduced, with commentary, in Władysław Rapacki, *Ludność Galicyi* (L'viv, 1874).

[5] The completion of the Cracow-L'viv railway, which followed the liquidation of the guilds by one year, was probably more responsible for flooding the Galician market with foreign goods than was the abolition of the guilds. Many artisans, however, perceived the influx of factory wares to be a direct result of the guilds' dissolution. Thus the craftsmen of Rzeszów presented to the Galician diet a petition which called for the restoration of the guilds in order to protect local industry. The whole problem of the Austrian reforms of the 1860s and their effect on the Galician artisans deserves a separate study.

[6] *O potrzebie stowarzyszeń przemysłowych czyli rzemieślniczych* (L'viv, 1864). Alfred Szczepański, *Cechy i stowarzyszenia* (Cracow, 1867). Tadeusz Romanowicz, *O stowarzyszeniach* (L'viv, 1867). Tadeusz Skałkowski, *Warsztaty i fabryki a postęp przemysłowy* (L'viv, 1869). A. D., "Dopysy: Zi L'vova," *Osnova,* 1872, nos. 30 and 38.

new associations differed from the guilds not only in that membership was voluntary, but in that they tended to unite artisans of all trades. There were, to be sure, some associations formed for specific trades, but most of the new associations organized artisans around some other common denominator, such as level of advancement (master or journeyman), sex, religion, or nationality.[7]

Most of the artisan associations had a Polish character, but a few were Jewish and six were Ukrainian. The first specifically Ukrainian artisan association was Pobratym [Blood brother], founded in L'viv in 1872. Pobratym was the model for the other Ukrainian artisan associations that emerged in Galicia in the 1870s: Pomich [Aid], established in Pidhaitsi in 1873; Nadiia [Hope]—Zbarazh, 1874; Poruka [Surety]—Pomoriany, 1875; Tovarystvo mishchans'ke [Society of burghers]—Skalat, 1875; and Ruskii tsvit [Ruthenian bloom]—Hlyniany, 1875.[8] The Ukrainian artisan associations did not last long, a problem to which we shall return. Pobratym dissolved voluntarily in 1875, and by 1878 none of the other Ukrainian artisan associations were in existence.[9]

The Ukrainian associations had goals and statutes similar to those of other voluntary artisan associations in Galicia. The statutes of Pobratym, which were typical, declared its purpose to be "the education and material assistance of its members." The statutes outlined four ways Pobratym served this purpose: (1) by establishing a library for members' use, (2) by arranging lectures and evening entertainment, (3) by finding employment for unemployed members, and (4) by providing loans and subsidies for members.[10] Thus, the artisan association tried to meet the real needs of its

[7] On Polish artisan associations in Galicia, see Emil Haecker, "Początki ruchu robotniczego w Galicji," *Niepodległość* 7 (January-June 1933): 14-28, and Walentyna Najdus, "Klasowe związki zawodowe w Galicji," *Przegląd Historyczny* 51, no. 1 (1960): 123-31.

[8] Pavlyk, "Pro rus'ko-ukrains'ki narodni chytal'ni," p. 516. The association in Hlyniany was mentioned as currently in the process of formation by [Volodymyr Navrots'kyi], "Pis'mo iz Galitsii," *Kievskii telegraf,* 7 March 1875, no. 29, p. 1.

[9] There was, however, a revival of artisan associations in the mid-1880s. Zoria [Star] was founded in L'viv in 1884, Pomich was restored in Pidhaitsi in 1884, and a branch of Zoria was established in Stryi in 1888. Kost' Levyts'kyi, *Istoriia politychnoi dumky halyts'kykh ukraintsiv 1848-1914,* 2 vols. (L'viv, 1926-27), 1: 223-25. Stepan Shakh, *L'viv—misto moiei molodosty,* pts. 1-2 (Munich, 1955), p. 181. *Bat'kivshchyna,* 1884, no. 13, p. 78, and no. 22, p. 129; 1886, no. 8, p. 45. *Praca,* 1885, no. 3, p. 12; 1888, no. 2, p.8. Iwan Franko, "Echa rusińskie," *Kraj* (St. Petersburg), (8) 20 April 1888, no. 15, p. 7.

[10] *Ustav remisnychoho tovarystva Pobratym* (L'viv, 1872). The Viceroyalty confirmed Pobratym's statutes on 22 July 1872.

The statutes of Pomich in Pidhaitsi copy those of Pobratym almost word for word: "O remesl'nychom tovarystvi 'Pomich' v Podhaitsiakh," *Russkaia rada,* 1 (13) Sep-

members. Loans were important for acquiring raw materials and for establishing independent workshops, and the artisan association would provide cheaper credit than the local usurer. As an employment bureau, the association could provide a valuable service, especially now that the guilds had been dissolved. Then, too, the association's premises functioned as a club house for artisans, where they could gather, as in Pobratym, to read popular newspapers or to play billiards.[11]

To make loans, to rent premises, to subscribe to newspapers, to set up a billiard table—all this cost more money than the artisans had. The Galician artisan of the 1860s and 1870s was impoverished and the dues he could contribute to an association were pittances.[12] The budget of Pobratym for 1872 demonstrates just how little the dues of artisan members contributed to the financial growth of the association. Out of Pobratym's total cash income in 1872 (482 gulden, 83 kreuzers), the artisans' entrance fees and dues amounted to only a little over 3 percent (15 g., 60 kr.).[13] Not the artisan, but someone else was paying for the voluntary artisan association.

Donations from non-artisans constituted the major source of revenue for the voluntary artisan association. In fact, almost all the associations, Pobratym among them, established a special category of membership for non-artisan donors. These honorary members, in contrast to the artisan members, could not borrow from the association's treasury. They could, however, hold office in the association, and in actual practice non-artisan honorary members dominated the presidency of most Galician artisan associations, including Pobratym. Honorary members, then, as the financial backers and chief officers of the artisan associations, were in an excellent position to influence the artisans of Galicia.

What did these honorary members have to gain by their participation? The best way to answer that question is to look briefly at the role artisans played in the Polish national movement in Galicia. Throughout the 1860s, but particularly in 1868 and 1869, artisans had figured prominently in

---

tember 1873, no. 17, pp. 133–35. As will be shown below, Pomich's statutes later underwent a telling evolution.

Levyts'kyi, *Istoriia politychnoi dumky*, 1: 222–23, quotes from a revised version of Pobratym's statutes (unavailable to me) printed in 1874 in both Polish and Ukrainian.

11 Pobratym's billiard table is mentioned in *Pravda*, 1874, no. 1, pp. 47–48.

12 For sample budgets of Galician artisans, see Andrii Kos [N.S.], "Zhyt'e, dokhody i bazhan'a komarn'ans'kykh tkachiv," *Dzvin* (L'viv) 1878, pp. 269–71, and I[osyp] D[anyliuk], "Zaribky i bazhan'a l'vivs'koho zetsera," *Molot* (L'viv) 1878, p. 145. See also Stanisław Hoszowski, *Ceny we Lwowie w latach 1701–1914* (L'viv, 1934), pp. 144–45.

13 *Pravda*, 1873, no. 2, p. 96.

demonstrations in L'viv, Galicia's capital. These demonstrations aimed at stiffening the Diet's resistance to Austrian centralism and at winning for the Poles a measure of sovereignty in an autonomous Galicia. Although the overwhelming majority of artisans could not even vote (they did not have the requisite property to qualify for the franchise), they became politically important because of their ability to exert pressure through demonstrations in the capital city. In fact, through such means, the artisans of L'viv had much to do with the eventual establishment of Galicia as a factually autonomous crownland dominated by the Polish nobility.[14]

The voluntary artisan association facilitated the artisan's participation in politics. About one thousand of L'viv's artisans belonged to the Polish artisan association Gwiazda [Star]. Non-artisan Polish autonomists had founded Gwiazda in 1868; they subsidized the association's treasury and controlled its administration. Gwiazda's statutes, like those of other artisan associations, stressed entertainment, education, and mutual aid; the statutes made no mention of any political goal. Nonetheless, Gwiazda's political aim was clearly understood: whenever the Polish autonomists so required, hundreds of artisans would march in the streets of L'viv.[15] Members of Gwiazda were in the forefront of the demonstrations of 1868 and 1869.

This, then, is at least one reason why non-artisan patriots might readily finance voluntary artisan associations: the artisan associations could be politically effective instruments of the national movement, especially as components of the urban crowd.

II

In considering the emergence of Pobratym in 1872 and its collapse only three years later, it might be useful to keep in mind Ostap Terlets'kyi's criticism of the Ukrainian national movement in Galicia. Writing in 1874, Terlets'kyi took to task the leaders of the national movement for too strong an addiction to poetry. He said that their poetic fancy constantly tempted them to try solving all problems with a single bold stroke. The single bold stroke would inevitably fail, and the disenchanted national

[14] Kazimierz Wyka, *Teka Stańczyka na tle historii Galicji w latach 1849–1869* (Wrocław, 1951).

[15] John-Paul Himka, "Polish and Ukrainian Socialism: Austria, 1867–1890" (Ph. D. diss., University of Michigan, 1977), pp. 15–21, 48–55, 61.

leaders would retreat from the need for painstaking, prosaic work by withdrawing into apathy and inactivity.[16]

The establishment of Pobratym in L'viv in 1872 may have been conceived as precisely such a bold stroke, a panacea for the troubles of the Ukrainian national movement. After all, the Ukrainians had just suffered a severe setback in the accession to power of the Polish nobility, and they had just witnessed the political effectiveness of the urban crowd during the demonstrations of 1868 and 1869. It is quite likely that the leaders of the Ukrainian movement felt that Pobratym would be another Gwiazda, an effective political instrument of the national cause. Confirming this notion is Pobratym's establishment as a deliberate rival to the Polish association Gwiazda.[17]

Pobratym was, at first, the darling child of the Ukrainian national movement in L'viv. Characteristically, the initiative to create a specifically Ukrainian artisan association did not spring from the L'viv artisans themselves. Rather, it was a local gymnasium teacher, Markyl' Zhelekhivs'kyi, who first came forward with the project. Other patriotic intellectuals readily supported him and so, too, did major institutions of the national movement in L'viv. Especially the educational society Prosvita, to which Zhelekhivs'kyi belonged, pledged "everywhere to maintain and nurture the Ruthenian [Ukrainian] spirit among artisans, namely, by means of popular lectures."[18] Prosvita donated 100 gulden to Pobratym, and another Ukrainian institution, the Stavropigian Institute, donated 75 g. These same two institutions, as well as the Halytsko-russkaia matytsa and the editorial board of the journal *Pravda,* donated books to the fledgling Ukrainian artisan association.[19] Individual priests, lawyers, members of the bureaucracy, educators, and students also made contributions to Pobratym and thereby became eligible for honorary membership.[20] *Pravda* consistently publicized these donations to Pobratym in order to encourage contributions to the association that "aims at awakening patriotism in the most important part of the nation, our city-dwellers."[21] "The Ruthenian public," affirmed *Pravda* in 1873, "should

16 Ostap Terlets'kyi, "Halyts'ko-ruskyi narid i halyts'ko-ruski narodovtsi," *Pravda,* 3 (15) November 1874, no. 18, pp. 749–52.
17 *Spravozdanie z dilanii "Prosvity" vid . . . 1868 roku, do nainoviishoho chasu* (L'viv, 1874), pp. 13–14.
18 *Spravozdanie z dilanii "Prosvity,"* pp. 13–14.
19 *Spravozdanie z dilanii "Prosvity,"* pp. 13–14. *Pravda,* 1873, no. 2, p. 96.
20 Lists of donors appeared in *Pravda,* 1872, nos. 2, 3, 7, 9; 1873, nos. 2, 8, 18; 1874, nos. 8, 9; and in *Osnova,* 3 May 1872, no. 31, p. 4.
21 *Pravda,* 1872, no. 5, p. 254.

pay more attention to these pioneers of Ruthenianism in our class of craftsmen burghers."[22]

This initial enthusiasm for Pobratym must be seen in the context of what the leadership of the Ukrainian national movement expected of the artisan association. The founders of Pobratym had estimated that *half* of Gwiazda's membership was ethnically Ukrainian and they hoped that these ethnic Ukrainians would abandon the Polish association for Pobratym.[23] Gwiazda's membership in the years 1872–1875 (the years Pobratym existed) grew from 945 to 1,350.[24] Thus, if Pobratym had really attracted half of Gwiazda's membership, this would have been a sizable gain for the Ukrainian national movement at the expense of the rival Polish movement. The founding of Pobratym did raise the dander of Polish nationalists, who comforted themselves that Gwiazda had "nothing to lose if a few filthy elements depart."[25]

If, however, as we are arguing, the leaders of the Ukrainian movement felt that Pobratym would be another Gwiazda, they were altogether mistaken. Pobratym attracted nothing like the hundreds of artisans expected. Only 20 artisans, mainly former members of Gwiazda, joined Pobratym when it was founded in 1872. In 1873, Pobratym had 74 members, and in 1874—70 members.[26] The failure to recruit a sizable membership represented the failure of the bold stroke, and it produced the characteristic

22 *Pravda,* 1873, no. 5, p. 206.

23 M. Dragomanov, "Literaturnoe dvizhenie v Galitsii," in *Politicheskia sochinenia,* ed. by I. M. Grevs and B. A. Kistiakovskii (Moscow, 1908), p. 347. Drahomanov was well informed about the Ukrainian national movement in Galicia. He followed its progress in the press and in the letters he received from Galician intellectuals. One of his closest associates in Galicia at this time was Mykhailo Dymet, the president of Pobratym. M. P. Drahomanov, *Literaturno-publitsystychni pratsi,* 2 vols. (Kiev, 1970), 2: 167, 170, 285–86; see also 2: 192–93 for Drahomanov's accidental visit to Pobratym's premises.

Although Gwiazda was a primarily Polish organization, and patriotically Polish at that, Ukrainians had been included in its ranks from the start. Indeed, judging by his name (Dymytr Stokaluk), a Ukrainian delivered the opening address in 1868 at the meeting that decided to establish Gwiazda. Gwiazda's choir was bilingual, performing songs in Ukrainian as well as Polish. *Gazeta Narodowa,* supp., 8 March 1868, p. 2. *Dziennik Polski,* 27 March 1874, no. 70, p. 2.

24 *Sprawozdanie z czynności wydziałów Stowarzyszenia ... "Gwiazda" w ciągu roku 1872* [Lviv, 1873]. *Wiadomości statystyczne o mieście Lwowie,* vol. 3 (Lviv, 1877), pp. 71 and 73.

25 "Działalność p. Ławrowskiego," *Dziennik Polski,* 19 May 1872, no. 136, p. 1. Cf. *Osnova,* 28 May 1872, no. 38, p. 2; also Dragomanov, "Literaturnoe dvizhenie," p. 347.

26 "Novynky," *Osnova,* 23 April 1872, no. 29, p. 4. The figure 74 is given without any date by Ie. A. Iatskevych, *Stanovyshche robitnychoho klasu Halychyny v period kapitalizmu (1848–1900): Narys* (Kiev, 1958), p. 74. The figure from 1874 is from *Wiadomości statystyczne* 2 (1876): 60–61.

reaction of apathy and inactivity. The Ukrainian national movement lost interest in the artisan association and Pobratym dissolved voluntarily in 1875, only three years after its enthusiastic founding.[27]

The founders of Pobratym had greatly overestimated the strength of the Ukrainian element in L'viv's artisan population. Ukrainians were, in fact, a small minority. For one thing, in the days of the Polish Commonwealth, especially from the Counter-Reformation in the mid-sixteenth century, Ukrainians were often prohibited from practicing crafts. Many guilds, such as the boilermakers', watchmakers', butchers', brewers', and goldsmiths' guilds, included an article in their statutes barring entrance to Ukrainian Orthodox Christians.[28] Later, simply living in the largely non-Ukrainian city led to the denationalization of Ukrainian artisans. As Reverend Ivan Naumovych wrote in 1874: "When we look at our cities nowadays, we should not be surprised that a multitude of our Ruthenian burghers have become Polish in them; what should surprise us is that in our cities, not only in the small towns but in the bigger cities, descendants of our old Ruthenian burgher families still remain."[29]

Statistics confirm the Polonizing influence of the city. In 1890, for example, Ukrainians made up 42 to 43 percent of Galicia's total population, regardless whether religion or language served as the criterion of ethnic identification. In L'viv, however, 17 percent of the population was Greek Catholic—i.e., of Ukrainian ethnic origin—but only 7 percent used Ukrainian as its language of intercourse (*Umgangssprache*).[30] Thus, over half of L'viv's ethnic Ukrainians were linguistically Polonized.

Unfortunately, statistics correlating nationality with occupation in L'viv do not exist for the 1870s. We do have statistics for later periods, however. In 1900, barely 5 percent of L'viv's "industrial" (artisanal) population declared Ukrainian as its language of intercourse,[31] and of L'viv's

27 *Wiadomości statystyczne* 3 (1877): 66, 69. Drahomanov complained that the leaders of the Ukrainian national movement "allowed Pobratym to go to sleep forever." M. P. Drahomanov, "Tretii lyst Ukraintsia do redaktsii 'Druha,'" in *Literaturno-publitsystychni pratsi,* 1: 426.

28 O. O. Nesterenko, *Rozvytok promyslovosti na Ukraini,* vol. 1: *Remeslo i manufaktura* (Kiev, 1959), p. 88. Ia. P. Kis', *Promyslovist' L'vova u period feodalizmu (XIII–XIX st.)* (L'viv, 1968), pp. 119, 122, 127, 137, 140, 146, 211–16.

29 [Ivan Naumovych], "Russkii mishchane," *Nauka,* 1874, no. 12, pp. 553–55.

30 "Die Ergebnisse der Volkszählung vom 31. December 1890 ..." *Österreichische Statistik,* vol. 32, pt. 1: "Die summarischen Ergebnisse der Volkszählung," pp. 106, 124, 163, 171.

31 All statistics for 1900 are taken from Józef Buzek, *Stosunki zawodowe i socyalne ludności w Galicyi według wyznania i narodowości, na podstawie spisu ludności z 31. grudnia 1900 r.,* Wiadomości statystyczne o stosunkach krajowych, vol. 20, no. 2 (L'viv, 1905).

total population of nearly 160,000, only 807 were Ukrainian-speaking artisans. We can imagine how few Ukrainian-speaking artisans there were in the 1870s, when L'viv was a much smaller city (87,109 in 1869) and when its Ukrainian ethnic element was also proportionately smaller (14 percent Greek Catholic in 1869).

In this context, Pobratym's ability to attract over seventy members was not such a bad showing. This becomes more evident when we compare Pobratym with the voluntary artisan associations of other nationalities in L'viv. In the early 1870s, each of L'viv's major nationalities—the Poles, Jews, and Ukrainians—had its own artisan association. In 1874, Gwiazda, the Polish association, had 1,250 members; Jad Charuzim [Hand of labor], the Jewish association, had 300 members; and Pobratym, the Ukrainian association, had 70 members.[32] Together, the three associations had a total membership of 1,620, of which the Polish association accounted for 77 percent; the Jewish, for 19 percent; and the Ukrainian, for 4 percent. Of L'viv's total industrial population in 1900, the Poles made up 65 percent; the Jews, 35 percent; and the Ukrainians (by language), 5 percent. As these statistics indicate, Pobratym was reasonably successful in attracting the Ukrainian-speaking artisans of L'viv. The real problem was that there were just too few Ukrainian artisans to sustain the association. Here we can note that L'viv's still smaller minority of German artisans did not have a separate German artisan association.

The statistics cited above indicate why the Ukrainian national movement, unlike the Polish national movement, could not build a mass constituency among the artisans of L'viv, why Pobratym could never be the equivalent of Gwiazda, and why, therefore, Pobratym failed. The collapse of Pobratym only demonstrated that the Ukrainian national movement, if it were to become a mass movement, had no choice but to recruit its adherents in the countryside, among the peasantry. This, of course, is precisely what occurred. L'viv remained the intellectual center of the national movement, but the strength of that movement was in its proliferating village institutions, reading clubs (*chytal'ni*) and cooperatives. Indeed, the characteristic feature of the Ukrainian national movement in late-nineteenth century Galicia was its penetration into the village.

Granted that the Ukrainian movement had to have a rural rather than an urban base, we might pose the question: what consequence did this have for the movement as a whole? What would be the difference between a national movement based in the city and one based in the countryside?

[32] *Wiadomości statystyczne o mieście Lwowie* 2 (1876): 60–61.

Perhaps a partial answer to these questions can be obtained by comparing analogous national institutions as they developed in Lviv and as they developed in the surrounding countryside—that is, by comparing Pobratym in Lviv with similar Ukrainian artisan associations in the provincial hamlets.

III

In looking at Pobratym's rural counterparts, we find additional confirmation of two arguments already advanced: namely, (1) that the leaders of the Ukrainian national movement hoped to make of Pobratym what Polish autonomists had made of Gwiazda—the nucleus of a mass constituency in the capital city, Lviv, with its implicit political potential; (2) that for the Ukrainian movement, however, the only place to recruit a mass constituency was not the city, but the countryside.

We may infer the importance the national movement placed on Poratym as an institution in Lviv from the relative indifference it displayed towards the artisan associations elsewhere. As mentioned previously, the growth of Pobratym's treasury depended very much on voluntary gifts and the contributions of honorary members. In 1872, this source of revenue accounted for 92 percent of Pobratym's total cash income, and in 1873 for 56 percent (a great part of the remainder consisted of repaid loans, thus the recirculation of capital originally received as donations). But Pomich, the artisan association in Pidhaitsi, was nowhere near as favored with donations as its counterpart in Lviv. During the first year of Pomich's existence (August 1873 - August 1874), donations and the dues of honorary members amounted to only 36 percent of its cash income. By the same token, the dues of artisan members formed a larger percentage of total cash income in Pomich (56 percent) than in Pobratym (1872—3 percent, 1873—6 percent). Nor did Pomich benefit as much as Pobratym from book donations: Pomich's single largest expense was the purchase of books and subscriptions to the periodical press (42 percent of its expenditures). Pobratym in Lviv had an income of 483g. in 1872 and 667g. in 1873; Pomich in Pidhaitsi had an income of only 192g. in 1873-74.[33] Clearly, if the preference of donors is any indication, the national movement cared more about the artisan association in Lviv than about the one in Pidhaitsi. The Ukrainian press did not even publish the

[33] *Pravda*, 1873, no. 2, p. 96, and no. 8, p. 316; 1874, no. 1, pp. 47–48, and no. 15, p. 646.

budgets of the other Ukrainian artisan associations in the countryside.

Neglected as they were, the Ukrainian artisan associations in rural Galicia were relatively more successful than Pobratym in attracting members. Pomich in Pidhaitsi, for instance, had about 50 members in mid-1874 and Nadiia in Zbarazh had 51 members in that same year.[34] Considering that Pidhaitsi had a population of 4,579 in 1869 and Zbarazh a population of 7,115, the associations in these hamlets put Pobratym to shame: the L'viv association could attract only 70 members from a population of nearly 90,000. Even if we measure the drawing power of these artisan associations relative to the size of the ethnic Ukrainian (Greek Catholic) populations of their respective cities, we find that the rural associations significantly outshine the one in L'viv. Five of every hundred ethnic Ukrainians in Pidhaitsi belonged to Pomich and three of every hundred in Zbarazh belonged to Nadiia, but a mere six of every thousand ethnic Ukrainians in L'viv belonged to Pobratym. This contrast underscores the fact that the Ukrainian movement, as a mass movement, could only thrive in the countryside. Furthermore, outside of L'viv, no true city in Galicia, neither Ternopil' (pop. in 1869—20,087) nor Kolomyia (pop. 17,679), produced a single Ukrainian artisan association. The five Ukrainian artisan associations (excluding Pobratym) were all located in semi-agricultural towns with populations under 7,500.

At this point let us take up the question posed earlier, namely: what can a comparison between Pobratym and the associations in the countryside imply about the difference between an urban-based and rural-based national movement?

The first to compare the rural artisan associations with Pobratym was a Ukrainian socialist from the Russian Empire, Serhii Podolyns'kyi. When visiting Galicia in the 1870s, Podolyns'kyi made a point of calling on various artisan associations. His observations, therefore, stem partly from first-hand experience. In Pomich in Pidhaitsi, Podolyns'kyi was struck by "the overwhelming influence of the clergy." "Only in the L'viv society Pobratym," he reported, "do we fail to note the decisive influence of the clerical element."[35]

A look at the administrations of the various artisan associations corroborates Podolyns'kyi's opinion. The honorary members who served in Pobratym's administration included educators, a government official,

[34] *Pravda,* 1874, no. 15, p. 647. [Sergei] P[odolinskii], "Meshchansko-rabochia tovarishchestva samopomoshchi v Galitsii," *Kievskii telegraf,* 4 May 1875, no. 53, p. 1.
[35] Podolinskii, "Meshchansko-rabochia tovarishchestva samopomoshchi v Galitsii."

and a merchant, but no priests.[36] Nadiia in Zbarazh, however, and Pomich in Pidhaitsi elected mainly priests as the honorary members in their administrations.[37]

The clerical influence in the rural associations is also discernible in their codes of conduct. In L'viv, Pobratym could expel a member for something the statutes vaguely termed "roguish behavior." But in Pidhaitsi, members of Pomich had to abstain altogether from alcohol and observe the association's regulations concerning how long a wedding might last as well as what might be served and who should be invited to a christening. Nadiia in Zbarazh imposed fines on members for drinking alcoholic beverages during Lent.[38] These regulations are significant, in that they reflect a peculiarly clerical social program current in late-nineteenth century Galicia.

In the late 1860s, a Galician priest, Father Stepan Kachala, made an inquiry into the causes of the Ukrainian peasant's poverty and then formulated a social program that the Greek Catholic clergy as a whole soon adopted for its own. Father Kachala did not find the roots of the peasant's poverty where secular investigators have suggested these roots lay: in the inequitable terms of emancipation, in the transition to a money economy, and in the absence of factory industry to absorb the surplus labor in the countryside. Instead, Father Kalacha found the peasant guilty of vices that led to his impoverishment: drunkenness, prodigality, and sloth. As antidotes to these vices, he suggested, among other things, abstinence, thrift, and enterprise.[39] This interpretation of society in terms of virtue

36 Honorary members who served in Pobratym's administration included Dr. Kornylo Sushkevych, secretary to the Imperial Procuratorium of the Treasury, Markyl' Zhelekhivs'kyi, gymnasium teacher in L'viv, and Oleksander Ohonovs'kyi, docent at L'viv University. In both 1873 and 1874, honorary member Mykhailo Dymet headed Pobratym. Dymet was a merchant by profession and a patriot of progressive inclinations. *Pravda,* 1872, no. 8, p. 405; 1874, no. 1, p. 47, and no. 15, p. 647. On Dymet, who played a role of some importance in the development of the Ukrainian national movement, see Pavlyk, "Pro rus'ko-ukrains'ki narodni chytal'ni," pp. 476–77, and Levyts'kyi, *Istoriia politychnoi dumky,* 1: 100–101, 142.

37 *Pravda,* 1874, no. 15, p. 647. Podolinskii, "Meshchansko-rabochia tovarishchestva samopomoshchi v Galitsii."

38 *Ustav ... Pobratym,* p. 5. *Pravda,* 1874, no. 15, p. 646. *Russkaia rada,* 1875, no. 5, p. 40.

39 [Stepan Kachala], *Shcho nas hubyt' a shcho nam pomochy mozhe* (L'viv, 1869). One of Kachala's objections to the growing influence of Drahomanov on Galician students was that "Drahomanov does not consider the poverty of the people to be the result of their sloth, spendthrift ways, and drunkenness." Letter of Kachala to the editorial board of *Druh,* 7 August 1876, in *Perepyska Mykhaila Drahomanova z Mykhailom Pavlykom (1876–1895),* ed. by Mykhailo Pavlyk, 7 vols. [numbered 2–8] (Chernivtsi, 1910–12), 2: 79–80.

and vice distracted its adherents from the real problems of Galician society and economic life. It gave comfort to the wealthier strata of Ukrainian society, to which the Greek Catholic clergy belonged, since it blamed the poor themselves for their poverty; in fact, it made their poverty morally reprehensible. In spite of its reactionary character, this clerical, almost theological, view of society was extremely influential in Ukrainian Galicia. The rural artisan associations testify to this. Pomich's and Nadiia's rules on abstinence countered the vice of drunkenness. Pomich's regulations about marriages and baptisms countered the vice of prodigality, for priests felt that the festivities connected with such events were all too extravagant for the lower classes.

The difference, then, between an artisan association in the city, L'viv, and those in the countryside is that the former was a secular institution and the latter were clerical ones. The same held true for the Polish artisan associations of Galicia; Gwiazda in L'viv was a secular, political organization, but its branches in the provinces were clerical.[40] While the capital city of L'viv had many non-priests to draw upon for financial support and leadership, the Galician hinterland had a dearth of secular intelligentsia. An analysis of the cumulative membership of the Ukrainian educational society Prosvita from 1868 to 1874 shows this. Excluding peasants, the clergy made up 65 percent of all Prosvita's members in the countryside. Prosvita's secular intelligentsia, however, was overwhelmingly concentrated in the cities (80 percent).[41] For the Ukrainians, then, priests constituted the only class in rural society with the financial and educational resources to give leadership to nationally-oriented institutions. Accordingly, if the Ukrainian national movement were to be rural-based, it would have to reckon with the indispensability of clerical influence.

Comparing the rural associations to Pobratym establishes three characteristics of the artisan associations in the countryside: (1) they were financially poorer than their counterpart in L'viv, (2) they were more successful in recruiting members, and (3) they were more clerical. In light of these characteristics we might speculate about why the rural artisan associations collapsed, as did Pobratym, after only a few years of existence. Pobratym, it has been argued, collapsed because it failed to attract a sizable membership. Obviously, the same cannot be argued for the rural associations, which were more successful in this regard. Instead, we might

[40] Emil Haecker, *Historja socjalizmu w Galicji i na Śląsku Cieszyńskim* (Cracow, 1933), p. 103.

[41] "Chleny tovarystva 'Prosvity,'" *Spravozdanie z Prosvity*, pp. 26–32.

consider how poverty and priests could have set up a self-destructive mechanism within the rural associations: because the rural artisan associations were in need of financial support, they bent over backwards to accommodate themselves to the local clergy; but the conditions imposed by the clergy were such that the artisans abandoned the associations.

The sources, unfortunately, do not allow an unequivocal confirmation of this hypothesis, but there is evidence to suggest that it is sound. Pomich in Pidhaitsi, for example, had very little income by comparison with Pobratym in L'viv. In August 1874, therefore, Pomich took a number of steps to increase its revenue. The association raised entrance fees for artisan members fivefold, from 20 kr. to 1 g., and imposed a moral obligation on each member to recruit an additional member. Simultaneously, Pomich started a campaign to attract honorary members, that is, benefactors. It invited a dozen local priests to attend its general meeting, and changed its statutes so that potential contributors paid less to become honorary members—they now paid either 10 g. in the course of a single year or pledged to pay 2 g. annually (formerly it had been 20 g. and 5 g., respectively). "Thus entrance for honorary members was made easier and the decision was taken to dispatch invitations to priests outside of Pidhaitsi and to other intelligent people, inviting their gracious entrance into the association Pomich, through which the association—both materially and morally—has much to gain, and thereby, too, the Ruthenian cause."[42] Moreover, the association elected an honorary member, Reverend Dmytro Huzar, to preside in place of the former president, an artisan.

These measures indicate how concerned Pomich was to attract honorary members, specifically priests, since in the countryside around Pidhaitsi, clergymen were the main potential source for honorary members. The desire to please and thus attract the clergy probably accounts for Pomich's stiff regulations, notably total abstinence and the rules concerning marriages and christenings. Nadiia in Zbarazh had imposed Lenten abstinence on its members, very likely for similar reasons.

The tendency of the Greek Catholic clergy to burden the national movement with oaths of abstinence had its negative effects. It is difficult to imagine why an artisan would continue to pay dues to Pomich if, on account of his "not totally amended behavior," he was denied the right to borrow from the association's treasury. Would he remain a member to hear more of Reverend Huzar's speeches as president, "the contents, manner of delivery, tone and spectacle of which penetrate all to the depths

[42] *Pravda*, 1874, no. 15, pp. 646–48.

of their souls"?[43] Perhaps not. Perhaps it is more probable that Pomich went the way of Nadiia, where quarrels between the artisans and the pastor of Zbarazh precipitated the association's collapse.[44] Such conflict between priests and artisans may have been inherent in the rural artisan associations, and this may explain why the associations did not remain in existence for more than a few years.[45]

* * *

In sum, the Ukrainian national movement in the early 1870s attempted to build a mass constituency in L'viv. To this end, Ukrainian intellectuals founded the Ukrainian artisan association Pobratym, modeled on the Polish association Gwiazda. Ukrainian artisans in the capital, however, were too few to make of Pobratym what its founders had hoped it would be. As a result, the association dissolved.

The failure of Pobratym meant that the Ukrainian national movement would have to recruit its mass constituency only outside the city, in the countryside. As the history of the rural artisan associations showed, this entailed the control of rural institutions by the Greek Catholic clergy. In a broader perspective, we can see that the control of these institutions would inevitably give the clergy exceptional influence and authority over the Ukrainian national movement in Galicia. How it would use that influence may be gathered from the experience of the rural artisan associations, where priests used their authority to further a narrowly-conceived, clerical social program which seems only to have provoked the resentment of the artisans.

University of Alberta

[43] *Pravda,* 1874, no. 15, pp. 646–48.
[44] *Russkaia rada,* 1876, no. 5, p. 40.
[45] The history of the conflict between priests and peasants in village reading clubs supports the argument made here for priests and artisans. I have elaborated on the social program of the clergy and the peasant reaction to it in "Priests and Peasants: The Greek Catholic Pastor and the Ukrainian National Movement in Austria, 1867–1900," *Canadian Slavonic Papers,* March 1979 (forthcoming).

REVIEWS

KNYHA I ZNANNJA: TEMATYČNYJ ZBIRNYK NAUKOVYX PRAC'. Edited by *M. P. Humenjuk* et al. Naukova biblioteka Stefanyka. L'viv: 1974. 174 pp. 1,500 copies.

This is the third collection of its type to be published by the Library of the Academy of Sciences in L'viv. The preceding two were published under the titles *Skarbnycja znan'* (1972) and *Biblioteka ta informacija* (1973). The present collection contains ten essays dealing with manuscript and book collections of the academy's library and, more generally, with the history of the Ukrainian book and Ukrainian bibliography.

The first category of essays comprises R. M. Bihans'kyj's articles on the Ilarion Svencic'kyj collection (pp. 124–[141]), M. A. Val'o's survey of holdings of publications of the Russian Academy of Sciences (pp. 142–[158]), and R. S. Xarabatov's essay on publications in Greek held in the Rare Books Division (pp. 162–[174]). The 420 volumes of rare Belorussica held by the library were donated by the family of I. S. Svencic'kyj in 1969. Bihans'kyj gives a history of the collection, discusses Svencic'kyj's work on Belorussia and its relation to that of Belorussian scholars, and surveys the collection under nine rubrics. In her essay Val'o strikes a chord sounded throughout *Knyha i znannja,* namely, that the library's holdings of Russica symbolize the solidarity between Russian and Ukrainian culture. She deals with the publications of the Russian academy under four rubrics: (1) serial publications of a general and academic nature, (2) miscellanies and monographs, (3) bibliographical publications, and (4) historiographical works on the academy. She also treats, in passing, Leniniana and publications by the party which deal with the Russian academy. Zarabatov's article on Greek publications from various periods is distinctly useful.

O. P. Kušč has contributed two essays to the collection. The first deals with the more than 150 works of Čexov translated in the Western Ukraine since 1889, as well as those in the original Russian and in Polish published separately and in serials (pp. 118–[123]). The second essay, which addresses the broader question of translations of the works of A. Blok into Ukrainian, focuses on the excerpts from "The Twelve" published in *Nova kul'tura,* 1923, no. 5, and the poem's

edition by Vasyl' Bobyns'kyj, a copy of which is held in the L'viv State Regional Archives (pp. 159–[161]). Kušč notes that the archival copy contains a protest against the press representative Moxnjux for the confiscation of a line of the poem, and he mentions that two other copies of the edition are held by the library.

The short essay by the collection's editor, M. P. Humenjuk, treats bibliography (here interpreted very broadly to include reviews) which appeared in the four liberal journals published in L'viv during the nineteenth century — *Druh* (1874–1877), *Svit* (1881–1882), *Narod* (1890–1895), and *Žyttje i slovo* (1894–1897). In a related essay the literary bibliographer Je. Je. Kravčenko surveys the archives of the Ukrainian socialist Myxajlo Pavlyk (1853–1915), with a view toward defining the points of controversy between the writer and Ukrainian "bourgeois-nationalists" (pp. 64–[88]). In particular, Kravčenko deals with Pavlyk's general social philosophy, his attacks on the Uniate church, and his propagation of the works of Marx and Engels. The essay by Je. M. Stasjuk surveys the primers published in Russia and the Ukraine from the sixteenth century to the Soviet period (pp. 87–[100]). The short essay by A. P. Tarapata describes the collection and services available in the Marxist-Leninist Division of the library (pp. 58–[63]). The collection's first and lengthiest essay, by bibliographer V. V. Mašotas, is essentially an extended commentary on the author's *Komunistyčna partija zaxidnoji Ukrajiny: Bibliohrafičnyj pokažčyk materialiv ta publikacij za 1919–1967 rr.* (L'viv: 1969).

Edward Kasinec
Harvard University

KNYŽKOVE MYSTECTVO NA UKRAJINI (1917–1974). By *O. Ovdijenko*. Introduction by *V. Kasijan*. L'viv: "Vyšča škola," 1974. 21 pp. [+ 63 ll.]. 5,000 copies.

Ovdijenko's work is an encyclopedic account of more than one hundred graphists of the Soviet period. Unfortunately, the introduction is highly politicized and contains little information about publishing, education for the graphic artist, or societies of graphists (mentioned in passing are organizations of graphists which exist in Kiev and the Kostandi Society in Odessa).

Two familiar themes are stressed. The first is the effort of Soviet graphics to overcome "formalism" and "constructivism (*proletkult*)" and to adapt the legacy of the nineteenth-century Russian and Ukrainian realists into "socialist realism." The second is the benign influence exerted on Ukrainian graphics by Russian artisans. For example, Ovdijenko emphasizes that Heorhij Narbut (1886–1920), a

protegée of Ivan Bilibin, also studied the work of V. Kustodijev, S. Čexonin, M. Dobužynskij, and D. Mytroxin, and that the Russian graphists O. Usačov, I. Pleščynskij, and V. Jung taught in the Ukraine. So important was the work of Narbut, says Ovdijenko, that he founded a school of graphics whose adherents include L. Lozovs'kyj, M. Kyrnars'kyj, L. Xyžyns'kyj, S. Požars'kyj, A. Sereda, V. Kryčevs'kyj, O. Marenkov, M. Alekseeva, and A. Straxov.

Ovdijenko has performed an important service for students of Ukrainian culture by making rare examples of early Soviet Ukrainian graphics more readily available (see especially 1.1.2–5). When his work is used in conjunction with Kasijan and Ju. Ja. Turčenko's *Ukrajins'ka dožovtneva realistyčna hrafika* (Kiev: "Naukova dumka," 1961), A. Špakov's *Xudožnyk i knyha* (Kiev: "Mystectvo," 1973), and O. Molodčykov's *Knyha Radjans'koji Ukrajiny* (Kiev: Vydavnyctvo polityčnoji literatury Ukrajiny, 1974), it provides a useful introduction to the little-studied field of modern book graphics.

Edward Kasinec
Harvard University

POLACY NA UNIWERSYTECIE KIJOWSKIM, 1834–1863. By *Jan Tabiś*. Cracow: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1974. 179 pp.

The Polish insurrection of 1830–31 brought an end to the Polish cultural exclusiveness in the Right-Bank Ukraine that was then centered at Vilnius. The Russian government closed the University of Vilnius and the Kremianets' Lycée, the most important Polish institutions of higher learning in the Russian Empire. In their place it established the University of St. Vladimir in Kiev (1834), which quickly became the intellectual center of the Right-Bank Ukraine and began to draw Polish students to Kiev.

This work by Tabiś is the first scholarly monograph to deal exclusively with the Polish students who attended the university at Kiev during the first thirty years of its existence. Drawing on archival sources in Cracow, Kiev, and Moscow, the author presents an excellent study of Polish student life in Kiev between 1834 and the January insurrection of 1863. The first chapter deals with the origins of the university, its administrative structure, and its functioning. The second chapter gives a thorough sociological analysis of the university's Polish students. The last chapter investigates the involvement of these students in the Polish revolutionary movement. Here, Tabiś describes and analyzes the various student cells, the student theater, the student scholarship societies, and the Sunday School movement; he also deals with the illegal books and pamphlets the students read and the preparations they made for the 1863 uprising.

The study emphasizes the participation of Ukrainians in the Polish revolu-

tionary movement, which reached its peak in the 1840s. A decade later, however, many young Poles and Ukrainians began to express their alienation from the aspirations of the Polish aristocracy and to identify themselves with the oppressed Ukrainian peasantry. Led by Tadeusz Rylski (Tadej Ryl's'kyj) and Włodzimierz Antonowicz (Volodymyr Antonovych), they vehemently disagreed with Polish claims to non-Polish ethnic territories, divorced themselves politically from the Poles, and began to lay the foundations for the Ukrainian national movement of the 1870s and 1880s. Despite his adherence to the current Soviet interpretation of Antonovych's *Hromada* as a "bourgeois-nationalist and liberal" group, Tabiś objectively traces the development of this irreconcilable ethnic and ideological split between the Poles and Ukrainians.

The actual subject of the book, however, is much narrower than its title suggests. The author discusses only the Polish students involved in revolutionary activity. By rarely mentioning the conservative students and by implying that most Polish students took part in the revolutionary movement, he exaggerates the influence and number of activists. Also, Tabiś does not indicate whether any students clashed with their parents over political issues. In discussing the Sunday School movement, he neglects to mention the conflict over the use of the Russian or Ukrainian language among the teachers, most of whom (81.39%) were ethnically Ukrainian, or the attitude of the Polish teachers. The author might also have mentioned Mykhailo Drahomanov and his participation in the Sunday School movement.

Despite these deficiencies, the study is a valuable contribution to an understanding not only of the Polish environment in Kiev, but of the emergent Ukrainian national and political movement in the 1834–1863 period.

George Liber
Columbia University

THE ANARCHISM OF NESTOR MAKHNO, 1918–1921: AN ASPECT OF THE UKRAINIAN REVOLUTION. By *Michael Palij*. Publications on Russia and Eastern Europe for Comparative and Foreign Area Studies, no. 7. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, [n.d.]. Copyright 1976. xii, 428 pp.

It is indicative of the interests of Western scholarship that the first English-language monograph on a figure of the Ukrainian Revolution deals not with Petliura, Hrushevs'kyi, Vynnychenko, Skoropads'kyi, Skrypnyk or Zatons'kyi, but with the peasant-anarchist Nestor Makhno. Dr. Palij has thus chosen a subject who is not only of intrinsic importance, but also one who will surely attract scholarly and general interest.

The central thesis of this work is reflected by its subtitle. Dr. Palij rightly believes that Makhno's movement cannot be understood in isolation from the other elements of the Ukrainian Revolution. It is an interest in the Ukrainian struggle for independence rather than an interest in anarchism or in peasant uprisings that dominates Dr. Palij's work. This is evident in his concluding evaluation of the movement:

> Only the united effort of all national forces under unified leadership and with a single goal could have established and maintained an independent Ukrainian state. Thus the Makhno movement was not a constructive factor in the Ukrainian National Revolution; important as its role was in the final outcome, it reflected all too well the lack of unity, the disparate aims within Ukrainian national development.

The monograph traces the formation and structure of the Makhno movement from 1918 to 1921, placing particular emphasis on Makhno's relations with Ukrainian, Bolshevik, and White forces. The imposing bibliography (103 pages) testifies to Palij's assiduous culling of data from all contemporary works on Makhno and the period. Although his criteria for differentiating primary and secondary works are unclear (see, e.g., the division of Makhno's writings, pp. 341–342 and pp. 391–393) and many of his items pertain to the Ukrainian Revolution rather than to the Makhno movement, Dr. Palij's bibliography represents the most complete listing of materials on the Makhno movement to date. Of particular interest are the manuscripts and texts of interviews that the author has gathered. From these sources, Dr. Palij has constructed a balanced account of the partisan leader and his movement.

While Dr. Palij has made a valuable corrective by viewing the Makhno movement in the context of the Ukrainian Revolution, he has devoted less attention than warranted to the movement's other aspects. His discussion of anarchist ideology, anarchist writers, and anarchism in practice is insufficient. Problems in the organization and administration of territories under the rule of Makhno's forces are treated only cursorily. Even Makhno's interactions with his opponents are not always explained satisfactorily (e.g., relations between Petliura and Makhno in September 1919). At times, memoir literature is treated uncritically. For instance, chapter 9, "Makhno's Visits with Kropotkin and Lenin," is based entirely on the account in Makhno's memoirs, without any corroborating evidence.

That the author did not examine the Makhno movement exhaustively is no doubt due largely to the paucity of available sources. Some essential archives, such as those of the Ukrainian National Republic, have been destroyed; others, such as those of the Bolshevik forces, are unavailable to Western scholars. Dr. Palij has had to write a history of the Makhno movement with access to only a handful of copies of the movement's major organ, *Put' k svobode.* While Soviet refusal to allow Western scholars access to the publications of the Makhno movement or to the surviving participants continues, one can only hope that this work will give impetus to the surfacing of publications held privately in the West and to

the collection of eyewitness reports. Dr. Palij's work does not answer all our questions about the Makhno movement, but it is an important step forward in the study of *Bat'ko* Makhno and the anarchist-influenced movement that he led in southern Ukraine.

Frank E. Sysyn
Harvard University

SHEKSPIR V UKRAINSKII LITERATURI. By *Maria Shapovalova.* L'viv: "Vyshcha shkola," 1976. 212 pp.

Since the nineteenth century, Shakespeare has fascinated Ukrainian writers to the extent that many learned English primarily to read him in the original. In 1964, contemporary Ukrainian writers published a number of studies to mark the 400th anniversary of William Shakespeare's birth.[1] A recent work is by Maria Shapovalova, who in 1950 wrote a dissertation at L'viv University on Ivan Franko as a Shakespearean scholar and translator. Her book deals with leading Ukrainian writers' interpretations and translations of Shakespeare, and with his effect on their work. The author states that her study is presented "in a historical perspective" — a claim significant in view of some political inferences and gross omissions.

The study is divided into three periods: the 1830s to 1860s, the 1870s to early 1900s, and the Soviet period. For the first period analyzed, Kharkiv and its university are credited with contributing greatly to the popularization of Shakespeare, primarily because many Ukrainian, Russian, and Polish literary scholars and translators of Shakespeare (M. Kostomarov, V. Lazarevs'kyi, I. Kronenberg, A. Walicki) lived and worked there. (Kostomarov was probably the first to translate Shakespeare into Ukrainian: Desdemona's song "Willow," in the 1840s.) Yet, Shapovalova notes, it was Kiev University that produced Pavlyn Svientsits'kyi and Panteleimon Kulish, the translators of complete plays. (Svientsits'kyi's translation of *Hamlet* was published in *Nyva* in 1865, and by 1882 Kulish had translated at least thirteen plays.) In her discussion Shapovalova diligently presents contemporary criticism from the time of the translations and introduces her own (for instance, she praises Kulish's style but is critical of his reliance on words from Old Church Slavonic and his use of Ukrainian equivalents, e.g., *het'man* for baron).

[1] The most significant were I. Vanina, *Ukrains'ka shekspiriiana* (Kiev, 1964), and N. A. Modestova, "Shekspir v ukrainskom literaturovedenii," in *Uil'iam Shekspir: Materialy i issledovaniia* (Moscow, 1964), pp. 250–304. An article by the Ukrainian Shakespeare Society in the West should also be noted: "Dusha storichchia," *Suchasnist'*, 1964, no. 7 (43), pp. 34–63.

In dealing with the second period, Shapovalova accords Mykhailo Staryts'kyi a special place in Ukrainian Shakespeariana, since his translation of *Hamlet,* which appeared as an annotated edition in 1872, was the first book in Ukrainian about the English dramatist's work (Staryts'kyi was also the first to stage Shakespeare in Ukrainian: although the staging of plays in Ukrainian was forbidden, he had scenes from *Hamlet* performed semi-privately at the Kievan *Hromada*). Shapovalova also discusses M. Krushelnyts'kyi, I. Karpenko-Karyi, M. Voronyi, and I. Franko. The author analyzed most thoroughly is Franko, who is credited with being the greatest Ukrainian pre-Soviet theoretician on Shakespeare and on translations of his works. The recognition is well warranted, for Franko edited and published Fed'kovych's and Kulish's translations, wrote studies of ten plays, translated several plays and sonnets, and even organized a Shakespearean Fund. Shapovalova is quick to claim that in his interpretation Franko used "the principle of materialistic criticism as well as his own theory of realism" (p. 132), and that he used Shakespeare's work to "counterattack anti-realist tendencies" (p. 141). Most of the translations are compared to the original, to a literal translation, and to other translations, and then Shapovalova offers her own evaluation. Besides style, the author considers other aspects: e.g., she criticizes Kulish for being too much of a moralist, and praises Staryts'kyi for stressing social conflict. She also notes the influence of Shakespeare on the original works of the translators, and on the work of T. Shevchenko, L. Ukrainka, and several contemporary Soviet Ukrainian writers.

The Soviet period, during which only fifteen plays have been translated, is presented rather scantily. The only literary studies discussed are by S. Rodzevych, O. Bilets'kyi, A. Shamrai, A. Hozenpud, I. Vanina, and M. Modestova. Except for M. Ryl's'kyi's work, other translations are treated superficially. Only a few translators (B. Ten, M. Bazhan, and V. Mysyk) are mentioned; others are grouped together as "numerous professionals." Neither this section nor the bibliography mentions I. Kocherha (translator of *The Taming of the Shrew*), I. Khotkevych (whose adaptation of *The Comedy of Errors* was published in 1924), H. Kochur (translator of *Hamlet*), V. Ver (translator of *Hamlet*), or I. Korets'kyi (translator of *Macbeth*). No mention is made of the sonnets translated and published by S. Karavans'kyi and D. Palamarchuk. Translations and literary studies by A. Nikovs'kyi, O. Borshchahivs'kyi, and B. Varneke are omitted, as are those by the pre-Soviet writers L. Hrebinka and M. Dashkevych.

Similarly, all publications in the West are ignored (to date, they include translations of twelve plays and two collections of sonnets, by M. Orest, Y. Klen, T. Os'machka, E. Kostetzky, Y. Slavutych, B. Kovaliv, V. Barka, S. Hordynsky, O. Tarnawsky, and O. Zujewskyj). Shakespeariana published in the Western Ukraine prior to 1945 (e.g., M. Rudnyts'kyi's translation of *Hamlet,* 1943) is also left unmentioned. The emphasis is continually on Shakespeare's popularization in the Ukraine by earlier Russian works. Even for the Soviet period, Ukrainian translations are said to be based on the achievements of earlier Russian translations. Shapovalova does not compare the impact of Shakespeare on Ukrainian

literature with his reception in other Slavic literatures, thus failing to treat her subject comparatively or "in a historical perspective" as claimed.

This potentially valuable study is marred by numerous omissions and perfunctory attempts at interpretations in line with Soviet ideology and practice. Shapovalova should have been more thorough in her coverage; works on Shakespeare published in the Ukraine in the 1960s were not as self-restrictive as hers is. Also, the author fails to provide a much-needed index.

Larissa M. L. Onyshkevych
Rutgers University

RUSSKIE SKOMOROKHI. By *Anatolii A. Belkin.* Akademiia nauk USSR, Institut istorii iskusstva. Moscow: "Nauka," 1975. 192 pp.

Although the *skomorokhi* have frequently been singled out by folklorists and cultural historians for their contribution to the literature, dance, theater, and music of the Eastern Slavs, they have to date received scant serious attention from scholars. Belkin's book is only the second attempt at a full history of these versatile minstrel-entertainers (the first was A. Famintsyn's *Skomorokhi na Rusi* [St. Petersburg, 1889]).

The book is divided into four chapters, followed by an appendix (which contains documents related to the formal proscription of the *skomorokhi* by Aleksei in 1648) and a comprehensive bibliography. Chapter one is devoted to a review of the literature. Chapter two attempts to solve the thorny problem of the origins of the *skomorokhi.* This is followed by a general account of their history from the eleventh through the seventeenth century and a concluding chapter on their role in the evolution of theater in Muscovy.

The most useful and enlightening chapters are the first two. Chapter one's review of the literature is thorough and competent, mirroring quite well the work on the *skomorokhi* of scholars in various disciplines. Chapter two focuses on the major theories proposed to explain the beginnings of *skomoroshestvo.* Belkin himself views the *skomorokhi,* in their formative period, as popular, pagan cult leaders whose roots pre-date the introduction of Christianity in Kievan Rus'. But, while tracing the phenomenon itself far back to hoary antiquity — as others, to be sure, have done before him — Belkin also maintains that the name *skomorokh* did not gain wide currency among the Eastern Slavs until the thirteenth century. Prior to this a variety of other names was used to describe the minstrel-entertainers. On this last point Belkin is less than convincing, as he does not provide sufficient proof to substantiate it.

The book has two major weaknesses. Chapter three, which attempts to trace the long history of the *skomorokhi,* is narrowly focused, superficial, and poorly

documented. One is puzzled, first of all, by Belkin's singling out of three dates — 1068, 1547, 1648 — associated with what he describes as popular uprisings in Kievan Rus' and Muscovite Russia, and then his structuring of the history of the *skomorokhi* around these. There can be no denying the fact, of course, that some of the itinerant minstrels (as opposed to the tax-paying, non-itinerant *skomorokhi*) had a reputation for mischief and lawlessness, as the *Stoglav* of 1551 makes clear. Nowhere in the sources, however, are the *skomorokhi* directly implicated in political activism. Their close identification with popular, or pagan, culture made them ready targets for the wrath of the church, but only rare targets of the state.

By viewing the *skomorokhi* through narrow ideological eyes, Belkin is forced to be selective in his sources. Conspicuous by its absence, for example, is the chronicle description of the mass transfer of *skomorokhi* from Novgorod to Moscow by Ivan IV in 1572. This was a significant turning point in the history of the minstrel-entertainers, who not only gained in Ivan an influential patron, but through him privilege and status at court, as well. Even more unfortunate is Belkin's failure to exploit the socioeconomic data of cadastres, census books, and customs duty records, which he cavalierly dismisses as unrepresentative and unreliable. Granted, these records are not complete or exhaustive, but they are, nonetheless, one of the few substantive sources of information that we have about the *skomorokhi.*

The book's other major weakness lies in Belkin's narrow perception of the historical significance of the *skomorokhi.* Practically nothing is said of their role in the recitation, dissemination, and preservation of *byliny* and other genres of oral literature, of their involvement in secular music and in the evolution of such musical instruments as the *gusli* and *gudok,* or of their long-standing tradition of folk dancing. By focusing exclusively on their activities as actors, bear tamers, and puppeteers, Belkin leaves the distinct impression that what he has written is a thinly veiled history of the Russian theater to 1650 rather than a history of the *skomorokhi.* Like Famintsyn before him, then, Belkin has missed the opportunity of securing for the *skomorokhi* their rightful place in the history of East Slavic popular culture.

Russell Zguta
University of Missouri–Columbia